

University of Alberta Library



0 1620 1243 7503

A26892

problems
of the
third
world

progress



The Policy of the Soviet Union in the Arab World

Translated from the Russian

*A Short Collection
of Foreign Policy Documents*

The USSR and the Arab World
ПОЛИТИКА СОВЕТСКОГО СОЮЗА НА АРАБСКОМ ВОСТОКЕ

На английском языке

First printing 1975

© Translation into English. Progress Publishers 1975

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

11102—921 90-75
014(01)—75

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CONTENTS

In the Name of Freedom, Progress and Peace	13
Decree on Peace. Adopted by the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets. Prepared by V. I. Lenin. October 26 (November 8), 1917	27
Appeal of the Soviet Government to All Moslem Labourers of Russia and the East. November 20 (December 3), 1917	30
From a Note of the Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the RSFSR, G. V. Chicherin, to the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. October 24, 1918	32
V. I. Lenin. From an Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East. November 22, 1919	33
V. I. Lenin. From "Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions" (For the Second Congress of the Communist International)	35
V. I. Lenin. From "Report of the Commission on the National and the Colonial Questions". July 26, 1920	36
V. I. Lenin. From "Report on the Work of the Council of People's Commissars, December 22" (The Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, December 22-29, 1920)	37
From a Note of the Soviet Government to the Governments of France, Great Britain, the United States and China. June 1, 1945	37
Speech of the Deputy People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the USSR in the UN Security Council on the Question of Withdrawing British and French Troops from Syria and Lebanon. February 15, 1946	38
From the Speech of the Representative of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, in the UN Security Council on the Withdrawal of British Troops from Egypt and the Sudan. August 20, 1947	39

Notes of the Soviet Government to the Governments of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Israel. November 21, 1951	40
From the Note of the Soviet Government to the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and Turkey. November 24, 1951	43
From the Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR on Security in the Middle East. April 16, 1955	45
From a TASS Communiqué on the Purchase of Arms by Egypt. October 1, 1955	48
From a Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Concerning Anglo-American Measures in the Middle East. February 13, 1956	48
From a Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR on the Situation in the Middle East. April 17, 1956	50
From the Statement of the Soviet Government on the Suez Canal. August 9, 1956	50
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR at the London Conference on the Suez Canal. August 16, 1956	52
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR at the London Conference on the Suez Canal. August 17, 1956	53
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR at the London Conference on the Suez Canal. August 21, 1956	55
From a Message by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. September 11, 1956	57
From a Message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Prime Minister of France. September 11, 1956	59
From a Message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. September 28, 1956	60
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR in the UN Security Council on the Suez Question. October 8, 1956	61
From a Statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR on the Reunification of Tangiers with Morocco. October 9, 1956	65
Statement by the Soviet Government on the Armed Aggression Against Egypt. October 31, 1956	65
Speech by the Representative of the USSR, A. A. Sobolev, at the Special Emergency Session of the UN General Assembly on the Aggression by Britain, France and Israel Against Egypt. November 3, 1956	67
From the Note of the Soviet Government to the Governments of Great Britain and France. November 4, 1956	68

Telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR to the President of the UN Security Council. November 5, 1956	69
Message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the President of the United States. November 5, 1956	71
Message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. November 5, 1956	73
Message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Prime Minister of Israel. November 5, 1956	75
Statement by TASS in Connection with the Aggression of Britain, France and Israel Against Egypt. November 10, 1956	76
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR at the Plenary Meeting of the UN General Assembly on the Question of the Withdrawal of British, French and Israeli Troops from Egypt. November 23, 1956	78
Statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR on the Reunification of Tangiers with Morocco. December 11, 1956	80
TASS Statement in Connection with the So-called Eisenhower Doctrine. January 13, 1957	81
Notes of the Soviet Government to the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France. February 11, 1957	82
Basic Principles of the Declaration of the Governments of the USSR, USA, Britain and France on Peace and Security in the Middle East and Non-Intervention in the Internal Affairs of the Countries of This Region	83
From the Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Apropos the Bermuda Conference of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Harold Macmillan. April 1, 1957	85
From a Note of the Soviet Government to the Government of the United States. April 19, 1957	86
Statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR on the Imperialist Intrigues in Jordan. April 29, 1957	87
From the TASS Statement on the Events in Jordan. May 25, 1957	89
TASS Statement Apropos Events in Oman. August 20, 1957	89
From a Note of the Soviet Government to the Government of Great Britain. September 3, 1957	91
From a Message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Prime Minister of Turkey. September 10, 1957	92
Answers of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, at a Press Conference on the Situation in Syria, Oman and Yemen. September 10, 1957	94
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, During a General Debate at the 12th Session of the UN General Assembly. September 20, 1957	97

Letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, to the President of the 12th Session of the UN General Assembly. October 16, 1957	98
From a Letter of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of France, Christian Pineau. March 1, 1958	99
TASS Statement on the Threat of Intervention by the United States and Other Western Powers in the Internal Affairs of Lebanon. May 18, 1958	100
From a TASS Statement on the Threat of Military Intervention by the United States and Britain in the Internal Affairs of Lebanon. June 24, 1958	101
Statement of the Soviet Government in Connection with Events in the Middle East. July 16, 1958	103
Statement of the Soviet Government in Connection with the Aggression by the United States and Great Britain in the Middle East. July 18, 1958	107
From a Memorandum of the Soviet Government to the Government of Turkey. July 24, 1958	110
From a Note of the Soviet Government to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. July 26, 1958	111
Note of the Soviet Government to the Government of Italy. August 1, 1958	112
Note of the Soviet Government to the Government of Israel. August 1, 1958	113
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, at the Special Emergency Session of the UN General Assembly on the Withdrawal of American and British Troops from Lebanon and Jordan. August 13, 1958	114
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, at the Special Emergency Session of the UN General Assembly on the Withdrawal of American and British Troops from Lebanon and Jordan. August 20, 1958	118
Note of the Soviet Government to the Government of Israel. September 5, 1958	122
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, in Connection with the General Debate at the 13th Session of the UN General Assembly. September 18, 1958	124
From the Soviet Draft Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples Introduced for Consideration at the 15th Session of the UN General Assembly. September 23, 1960	126
From a Note of the Government of the USSR to the Government of the UAR on the Proposal by the USSR Declaring the Mediterranean a Nuclear-Free Zone. May 18, 1963	127

Appeal of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, A. N. Kosygin, Transmitted to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Harold Wilson. June 5, 1967	129
Appeal of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, A. N. Kosygin, to the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. June 6, 1967	130
Statement of the Soviet Government	130
Appeal of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, A. N. Kosygin, to the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. June 8, 1967	131
Statement of the Soviet Government to the Government of Israel. June 7, 1967	132
Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU on the Policy of the Soviet Union in Connection with the Aggression by Israel in the Middle East. June 21, 1967	133
From the Declaration by the Central Committees of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the Governments of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. June 9, 1967	136
From a Speech by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, A. N. Kosygin, at the Special Emergency Session of the UN General Assembly. June 19, 1967	138
From a Speech by L. I. Brezhnev at a Reception in the Kremlin in Honour of the Graduates of Military Academies	141
From a Statement by the Soviet Government. July 23, 1967	144
TASS Statement. August 30, 1969	145
From a Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko, at the Plenary Meeting of the 24th Session of the UN General Assembly. September 19, 1969	146
TASS Statement. October 26, 1969	147
Statement on the Situation in the Middle East by the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and the Government of the Polish People's Republic, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. November 27, 1969	149

Telegram of N. V. Podgorny and A. N. Kosygin to Mr. Ahmed Hassan al Bakr, President and Prime Minister of the Republic of Iraq. Baghdad	151
From a Speech by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, N. V. Podgorny, at a Reception in the Kremlin in Honour of the President of the UAR, Gamal Abdel Nasser. June 31, 1970	152
From a Statement of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on the Situation in the Middle East. July 15, 1970	152
From a Statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. September 9, 1970	153
From a Statement by TASS. September 20, 1970	155
Apropos Events in Jordan. September 24, 1970	156
For the Establishment of a Firm Peace and Security in the Middle East. December 2, 1970	158
Statement of the Soviet Government. February 28, 1971	160
From the Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. March 30, 1971	164
From the Statement by the 24th Congress of the CPSU "For a Just and Lasting Peace in the Middle East"	165
From a Resolution of the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU. April 9, 1971	165
Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Arab Republic	167
To the General National Congress of the Arab Socialist Union of the United Arab Republic. July 25, 1971	172
From a Speech by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, A. N. Kosygin in the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria. October 6, 1971	174
From the Joint Communiqué on a Visit of the Government Delegation of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to the USSR. October 10, 1971	176
From a Joint Soviet-Egyptian Communiqué on a Visit of President of the UAR Anwar Sadat in the USSR. October 14, 1971	177
Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Iraq	179
From a Joint Soviet-Egyptian Communiqué on a Visit of President of the ARE Anwar Sadat in the USSR. April 30, 1972	183
From a Joint Soviet-Syrian Communiqué on a Visit of President of the Syrian Arab Republic Hafez Asad. July 9, 1972	184
Statement by the Soviet Government. August 18, 1972	184
From a Joint Soviet-Iraqi Communiqué on a Visit of President of the Republic of Iraq Ahmed Hassan al-Bakr in the USSR. September 20, 1972	186

From a Speech by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, A. N. Kosygin, at a Reception in Honour of the Prime Minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Aziz Sidki. October 16, 1972	187
From a Joint Soviet-Egyptian Communiqué on a Visit of the Prime Minister of the ARE, Aziz Sidki, in the USSR. October 19, 1972	188
From the Report by L. I. Brezhnev to the Joint Session of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. December 21, 1972	189

As a result of their determined, heroic national liberation struggle, the majority of the Arab countries have cast off the colonial yoke and entered the path of independent development. The time when the imperialist powers decided their fates has for ever passed.

The turning point in the struggle of enslaved colonial peoples for freedom and independence was the October Revolution in Russia. The Revolution marked the beginning of the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism and began the epoch of the liberation of the colonial peoples, who began to form their own independent states. The Revolution marked an epoch of national rebirth for the countries of Asia and Africa.

The revolutionary wave that rose in Russia swept through the countries of the East and sharply strengthened the anti-imperialist liberation movement. The victory of the Revolution in Russia and the young Soviet republic's ability to repel the troops of the foreign invaders gave the enslaved peoples of the East new strength and clearly demonstrated the possibility of successful struggle against imperialism. A number of Eastern countries, including several Arab countries, as a result of determined, heroic struggle, succeeded in winning their independence in those years.

The Soviet Union has at all times been on the side of the Arab countries in their struggle for national liberation. The important documents, speeches and declarations included in this book collection are a graphic testimony to this fact.

From the first days of its existence, the Soviet Union has come forward as a true and consistent friend and defender of all enslaved and oppressed peoples, including the peoples of the East. Soviet Russia, as Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, wrote, "extended the hand of friendship and brother-

As a result of their determined, heroic national liberation struggle, the majority of the Arab countries have cast off the colonial yoke and entered the path of independent development. The time when the imperialist powers decided their fates has for ever passed.

The turning point in the struggle of enslaved colonial peoples for freedom and independence was the October Revolution in Russia. The Revolution marked the beginning of the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism and began the epoch of the liberation of the colonial peoples, who began to form their own independent states. The Revolution marked an epoch of national rebirth for the countries of Asia and Africa.

The revolutionary wave that rose in Russia swept through all the countries of the East and sharply strengthened the anti-imperialist liberation movement. The victory of the Revolution in Russia and the young Soviet republic's ability to rout the troops of the foreign invaders gave the enslaved peoples of the East new strength and clearly demonstrated the possibility of successful struggle against imperialism. A number of Eastern countries, including several Arab countries, as a result of determined, selfless struggle, succeeded in winning their statehood in those years.

The Soviet Union has at all times been on the side of the Arab countries in their struggle for national liberation. The important documents, speeches and declarations included in this short collection are a graphic testimony to this fact.

From the first days of its existence, the Soviet Union has come forward as a true and consistent friend and defender of all enslaved and oppressed peoples, including the peoples of the East. Soviet Russia, as Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, wrote, "extended the hand of friendship and brother-

hood to all peoples of the East". The Soviet Union, guided in its foreign policy by Leninist principles, defended and defends the right of all peoples to independent statehood, and consistently calls for the equality of all states, both large and small.

The Soviet Government has continuously opposed colonial pillage and has favoured granting all oppressed and dependent peoples the right to determine their own destiny. It published and annulled the secret agreements concluded during the First World War among Britain, France and the tsarist government concerning the division of Turkish possessions. The Soviet Government determinedly exposed the mandate system of the League of Nations as covert colonialism. The USSR was the only great power that refused to recognise this system, including the mandates of Britain and France to Arab countries—Iraq, Palestine, Trans-Jordan, Syria and Lebanon. The Soviet Union criticised the outrageous, systematic capitulations forced on the East by the imperialist countries.

In 1924 the Soviet Government established normal diplomatic relations with Hejaz (the Arab Hashemite Kingdom), in 1926 with Saudi Arabia, and in 1928 with Yemen. The Soviet Union maintained friendly relations with them. A further expansion of Soviet-Arab contacts took place during the Second World War, when the Soviet Union established diplomatic relations with Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq. Relations between the Soviet Union and the Arab countries were especially strengthened in the postwar years.

After the Second World War, a new stage began in the national liberation struggle of the enslaved colonial peoples. The following created favourable conditions for a further strengthening of the national liberation movement in colonies and dependent countries: the defeat of the powers of the fascist bloc and the decisive role the Soviet Union played in the defeat; the formation of a world socialist system; the increase of the influence of the USSR and of other socialist countries on the development of international events. The imperialist powers were no longer able to maintain inviolate their rule over the countries they had enslaved.

The Arab countries, too, rose with more and more determination to the struggle against the colonisers. The Soviet

Government rendered them all possible aid and support in this struggle.

When Syria and Lebanon in 1946, and Egypt in 1947, demanded in the UN Security Council that foreign troops be removed from their territory, the Soviet Government energetically seconded this demand.

The Soviet Government decisively criticised the declaration made by the USA, Britain, and France on May 25, 1950. The declaration provided for joint action by the three powers to suppress the national liberation movement and thus it strengthened the position of the colonialists in the Middle East.

In its notes of November 21 and 24, 1951, and of January 28, 1952, the Soviet Government revealed the aggressive, colonialist character of the plans proposed by the United States, Britain, France and Turkey to create the so-called Middle Eastern Command, which provided for the intervention of foreign troops in the countries of the Middle East, the creation of foreign military bases.

When the Western powers began forming the Baghdad pact, the Soviet Government unmasked the true goals of the initiators of this military alliance. It showed that their plans were directed to recreating a colonial order in the Middle East, pulling the countries of this region into the aggressive alliances of the Western powers.

The position taken by the Soviet Government helped the Arab countries withstand the pressure placed upon them by imperialists attempting to draw them into military blocs.

The Soviet Union aided Morocco and Tunisia in their struggles for independence. The Soviet Government consistently, forcefully supported these countries' attempts to destroy the remnants of colonialism and to strengthen their independence.

The Soviet Union's role as the true and loyal friend of the Arab countries was especially apparent in 1956, at the time of the British, French and Israeli aggression against Egypt. In its declaration of October 31, 1956, the Soviet Government vigorously condemned the aggression. During the discussion of this question in the Security Council and at the special session of the UN General Assembly, the representatives of the Soviet Union energetically supported Egypt's

demand for an immediate end to this aggression. When the aggressors refused to fulfil the General Assembly's resolution that the intervention against Egypt should end, the Soviet Government gave due warning to the Governments of Britain, France and Israel. The heroic opposition by the freedom-loving Egyptian people, supported by the countries of the socialist camp and all progressive mankind, and, especially, the firm position taken by the Soviet Government, forced the aggressors to retreat.

Despite their defeat in Egypt, the forces of imperialism did not abandon their colonialist plans in the Arab countries and continued to seek ways and means to strengthen their influence there. This was expressed in the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine, the goal of which was to establish the imperialist domination over the countries of the Middle East, to take the natural resources of these countries, to convert these countries into military springboards. The Soviet Government in this instance, too, unmasked the insidious intentions of the colonialists and revealed the imperialist essence of the Eisenhower Doctrine.

Attempting to preserve a lasting peace in the Middle East, the Soviet Government on February 11, 1957, proposed that the United States, Britain, and France adopt a joint declaration on peace and security in the Middle East and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of this region. Had the US, Britain and France adopted the principles enumerated in the draft declaration, this would have helped strengthen peace and security in the Middle East, strengthened the sovereignty and independence of the countries of this region, created the necessary conditions for their economic and cultural development. However, the Governments of the United States, Britain and France declined the Soviet Government's proposal and continued their former colonialist policy in the Middle East.

After the failure of the Suez affair, the next victim of imperialist policy was Syria. In the autumn of 1957 the direct danger of armed intervention hung over Syria. The Soviet Government exposed these aggressive designs against Syria and gave it all-round support, which helped the Syrian people to defend its independence and led to the frustration of the sinister plans directed against it.

A new attempt by the imperialist forces to restore the position they had lost in the Arab East was made in the summer of 1958, when the United States landed troops in Lebanon, and Britain landed troops in Jordan. Intervention in Lebanon and Jordan was in turn a preparation for armed intervention in Iraq to restore the reactionary regime overthrown by the Iraqi people. In this situation the Soviet Union again defended with determination the interests of the Arab peoples.

Imperialist and Zionist circles resort to the most devious and subversive activities in order to paralyse the Arabs' struggle for liberation. Political blackmail, economic pressure, the organisation of mutinies and anti-governmental conspiracies, the continual provocations by Israel against neighbouring Arab states, bribery, diplomatic deception, big and small lies and, naturally, intimidation with the supposed "communist threat"—even this is not a complete list of the methods and means used by imperialism and Zionism for the maximum aggravation of the internal situation in the Arab world, for undermining the Arab unity and those forces which in a critical moment could come to their aid.

In the course of a number of years, a broad, new aggression was prepared against the Arab peoples, chiefly against progressive states in the front-line of the Arab liberation movement—Egypt, Iraq and Syria. This aggression was inspired by imperialist circles and executed by Israel, which attacked neighbouring Arab states in 1967. The Israeli army relied on the war potential of a number of NATO countries.

Thanks to the element of surprise, to treachery and air superiority, Israel succeeded in attaining a temporary military victory. But it is perfectly obvious that it will never become a final victory, especially a political one, that the delirious plans for the creation of a "Greater Israel" at the expense of the Arab countries and peoples will never be realised.

At that time, so difficult for the whole Arab world, the Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, took an inflexible position in support of the Arabs. The decisive steps and measures of the socialist states stopped the aggression at a moment crucial for the fate of the Arab peoples, prevented

the aggression from growing into an armed conflict of major proportions and kept the imperialist and Zionist conspiracy from realising its principal goals—to crush the Arab liberation movement, to destroy the forces aiding its development, to isolate the Arab world from the socialist community and, having accomplished this, to dictate their own terms to the Arabs. Characterising the position of the Soviet Government at that time, President Nasser stressed: "We say that if it weren't for Soviet aid after the June events of 1967, imperialism would have dominated our country, all our goals would have been crushed under the heels of the conquerors, and execution and murder would have been the laws of those who want to control the fate of the Arab nation."

The resolution of the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had great significance for the development of friendly Soviet-Arab relations.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU was an event of outstanding, world-wide significance. Its resolutions, which are being brought into life, have an enormous influence on international relations and the world revolutionary process. The Congress adopted a Peace Programme, which combines immediate and long-range tasks. The CPSU views them as links in a single, carefully thought-out political course in the world arena.

The Central Committee's report to the 24th Congress, delivered by its General Secretary, Leonid Brezhnev, characterised the main tendencies of world development, which are in essence that, in the sharp struggle of the forces of peace, freedom and progress with the forces of oppression, reaction and aggression, great social and political changes have occurred and do occur on our planet. The international position of the USSR has become even stronger and the role of the world socialist system expanded. The great union of the three basic contemporary revolutionary forces—world socialism, the international communist and workers' movement, and national liberation movement—continues to grow from strength to strength.

The main path of world revolutionary development is in the growth and strengthening of world socialism and in the further change in the balance of forces in its favour. As the

general crisis and all the contradictions of capitalism continue to be aggravated, its hostility to the fundamental interests of the peoples of the world is becoming even more evident.

The unity and solidarity of all the anti-imperialist and revolutionary forces is the most important condition for their success. The course of the leaders of the Communist Party of China towards a split in the unity of the anti-imperialist forces is inflicting immeasurable harm to socialism and the liberation movement and encouraging the imperialist aggressors.

Imperialism was and remains a dangerous and powerful enemy of the peoples' liberation movement, an enemy that stops at nothing. The 24th Congress of the CPSU reaffirmed the fraternal solidarity of the Soviet people with the heroic patriots of Indochina and sharply condemned imperialist aggression in the Middle East. "We have no doubt at all," said Leonid Brezhnev at the Congress, "that the attempts of imperialism to turn the tide of history, to make it flow in its favour, are bound to fail. However, we Communists are well aware that there is no room for passivity or self-complacency. The fighters against capitalist oppression are confronted by the last but the most powerful of the exploiting systems that have ever existed. That is why a long and hard struggle still lies ahead."¹ The front along which this struggle is being waged, and its tension, are becoming ever greater.

On the basis of a scientific analysis of the international situation and the main tendencies of social development, the Congress defined the foreign policy goals of the USSR. Its constructive Peace Programme is directed to the resolution of very important problems, on which depend the prevention of war, the development of co-operation between the governments of different social systems, the easing of tension in relations between states. The purposefulness of the Programme is reflected in the fact that everything in it is subordinated to the chief task—guaranteeing peace, international co-operation, the freedom and independence of peoples. The Programme is realistic, for it is the aggregate of practicable measures—some can be realised at this stage,

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1971, p. 22.

others at a more distant, though nonetheless definite, point in time. Many parts of this Programme have already been or are being realised.

The first task of the Peace Programme is the liquidation of the military hotbeds created by the imperialists in South-East Asia and the Middle East. Local wars in these regions not only cost human lives and destroy national wealth, they also threaten to spread the flames of war further. The 24th Congress proposed to bring about a political solution of the problems of South-East Asia and the Middle East rather than the military solution that the imperialists would impose despite the fact that the whole course of events has indicated its utter futility. The agreements negotiated in 1973 on the cessation of military activities in Vietnam and Laos dramatically reaffirmed the vitality and effectiveness of the programme of strengthening international peace advanced by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

As before, the USSR, as the Peace Programme stressed, favours the complete destruction of colonialism and the implementation of the resolution of the UN on this question. The demand of the USSR for a general censure and boycott of the manifestations of racialism and apartheid is unshakeable.

There is historical connection and continuity between the Decree on Peace and the Peace Programme adopted by the 24th Congress. The essential continuity of these two documents of Soviet foreign policy is demonstrated by the manifest concern for general peace, for the solution of international problems for the good of the popular masses. But in our day the range and opportunities Soviet foreign policy has for effecting its peaceful proposals have enormously increased. International developments since the Congress testify to this.

"Only a little over eighteen months have passed since the 24th Congress, but we can safely say that our Party and the Soviet state have gone a long way in implementing the most important propositions of the Peace Programme."¹

The whole course of recent developments in the international situation has shown the sincere, friendly feelings the Soviet people extend to Arabs. These feelings have withstood the test of time. The natural alliance of the Arab liberation movement with the socialist countries, an alliance that has arisen out of common goals in the struggle against imperialism, has turned into a mighty force guarding the independence of the Arab peoples.

But the experience of the postwar developments in the Arab world has shown something else, too—the depth of the hatred, hostility and anger the imperialists and Zionists have for Arabs who are striving for unity, freedom and independence. It is no exaggeration to say that undermining the friendly relations between the USSR and the Arab states is one of the central goals that the enemies of the Arabs have set for themselves. The imperialists use all the means at their disposal for this, including diplomacy and espionage, and their powerful propaganda machine. Operation within a number of Arab states by forces working for the same end as the imperialists cannot, of course, be justified. Resorting to shameless manoeuvres—to the poisonous tool of anti-communism—these forces intentionally distort and misconstrue the policy of the USSR vis-à-vis the Arab world. They raise doubts about its sincerity and impartiality. They subject the representatives of democratic forces, fighting for national liberation, to attack and slander. Imperialists and Zionists make use of these "ultra-patriots" of Arab nationalism, which they palm off with the slogan of the alleged "irreconcilability of Arabism and communism".

But this intentional undermining of Soviet-Arab friendship in the Arab world will never bear the desired fruit. One cannot deceive the peoples and their true national leaders. They know who are in practice the genuine friends of Arabs, they know the significance that friendship with the Soviet Union, with the fraternal socialist community has for their struggle for peace, happiness and freedom. The peoples of the USSR build their relations with the Arab world on the lasting basis of honourable and equal partnership and mutual respect. The peoples of the Soviet Union and the Arab countries firmly believe that their friendship

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The 50th Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow, 1972, p. 51.

and co-operation will in the future, too, grow stronger on the basis of the high principles of the defence of justice, peace and security for all peoples.

Like so many other countries of Asia and Africa that have entered the path of independent development, Arab countries face enormous tasks in overcoming economic backwardness, which is the result of the long rule of the colonialists. However, this important undertaking meets with great difficulties—lack of the necessary resources, a shortage of technical and engineering personnel and industrial equipment. One must take into account, too, the fact that imperialist forces are trying and will continue to try to delay economic development in these countries to preserve their own positions by any and all means.

The Soviet Government is rendering Arab countries great aid to develop their economies. The USSR has signed agreements with a number of Arab countries on economic and technical co-operation, given them favourable, long-term credits and is aiding them in the construction of a number of important industrial projects, in the development of agriculture, in carrying out mineral prospecting, in personnel training. A clear example of the friendly aid of the Soviet Union to the Arab countries is the construction of the Aswan High Dam on the Nile, a dam that realises the age-old dream of the Egyptian people of taming the waters of the Nile and using them to irrigate land that had earlier been claimed by the desert.

On January 9, 1961, the outstanding figure in the Arab liberation movement, Gamal Abdel Nasser, declared at a meeting in Aswan: "Marking today's event, we think first of all of the country that agreed to aid us in this work and which gave us credits and technical aid, the Soviet Union. There can be no question that the Soviet Union's credit and proposal for technical aid to carry out the construction were prompted only by a feeling of friendship that links the Arab world with the Soviet Union. This aid was absolutely not contingent upon any conditions or stipulations."

Eleven years later, in a telegram to the President of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, N. V. Podgorny, the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt Anwar Sadat, stressed: "The Aswan High Dam is a majestic construction that rises on

our land, in the middle of the African continent and that is a source of good and abundance and that is the clearest testament of what noble co-operation can yield, co-operation that unites our peoples on the path of struggle in the name of the well-being of man and liberation from backwardness and exploitation. . . . We are glad that the co-operation that exists between our peoples has as its goal the progress of man and his well-being and is directed against imperialism and colonialism and their activities in suppressing peoples."

But the meaning of the Aswan Dam, of course, is not only in its economic benefits. For the Arab peoples, it was the first real meeting with the world of socialism, with the Soviet people, whose disinterested and genuine aid gave an example of true fraternal relations between peoples. The Giant on the Nile affirmed, in essence, a new era in the struggle of the peoples of Egypt and the whole Arab world for economic and social liberation. Naturally, it also became a clear example of the practicability of a new type of relationship of economic co-operation, which has received an enormous response both in the Arab countries and in the in the whole world.

In 1971 the USSR and the Arab Republic of Egypt concluded a Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Co-operation which laid the political and legal basis for their relations. Soviet-Arab friendship received a new impetus.

The Soviet Union is aiding in the construction of many important economic projects in Syria. On the Euphrates a powerful hydro-electric station is being built that will irrigate up to 600,000 hectares of arid land and thereby significantly increase the arable land of the Syrian Arab Republic. The completion of the Latakia-Haleb-El Qamishliye railroad, 737 kilometres long, afforded remote regions of the country an outlet to the sea. With the aid of the Soviet Union, a number of light and food industry enterprises are rising in Syria. Soviet geologists have helped to discover large oil reserves, which specialists from Western countries "sought" in vain for decades.

The Soviet Union has helped Iraq to develop its oil industry; a special agreement on the oil industry was concluded between the two countries on June 4, 1969. When

the Revolutionary Command Council of Iraq on June 1, 1972, adopted the law nationalising the foreign Iraq Petroleum Company (IPC) they received full and active support from the Soviet Union. By the time the IPC was nationalised, Iraq had already created a national oil industry in Northern Rumaila with Soviet aid, and so there was a reliable base for the further attack on the imperialist position in the country. One cannot but observe that when the IPC was nationalised, Iraq benefited from a favourable international situation—the Soviet-Iraqi Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation was already in effect, and many-sided relations had developed between Iraq and other socialist countries. The co-operation between the Soviet Union and Iraq was not limited to the oil industry alone. The Soviet Union aided in the construction of the very important Baghdad-Basra railroad, the most important electric engineering plant in the Middle East in Baghdad, a radio station, an antibiotics plant, grain silos and other industrial projects.

The USSR is helping Algeria to build an iron-and-steel plant in the vicinity of Annaba, a plant that will fully meet the country's demand and will stimulate the development of Algerian iron-and-steel industry. An engineering plant is being built in the same place. In El-Abda a lead and zinc enrichment factory is being constructed, and important economic projects are being built in other areas of the country.

The USSR is giving significant aid to the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Sudan, the Yemen Arab Republic, and other Arab states. The Soviet Union is aiding some Arab countries to draw up long-range plans for economic development. Another important area of Arab-Soviet co-operation is Soviet aid in the training of skilled specialists for the economy and culture of the Arab countries. This aid has already allowed more than 50 educational institutions to be built and put into operation; these institutions include the Gas and Oil Institute in Algeria, and training centres in Egypt, Iraq, Syria and other countries. Every year several hundred young Arabs graduate from higher educational institutions in the Soviet Union and return to their native countries. Many of them later obtain their master and doctoral degrees in the Soviet Union.

One could say a great deal about Soviet-Arab contacts in scientific and cultural spheres, too. These contacts are wide-ranging and variegated.

Helping the Arab countries to develop the national economy, create a state sector, to prepare trained scholars, specialists, workers, and passing on all its experience in socialist construction, the Soviet Union strengthens the power and potential of the Arab peoples in their struggle with imperialism and Zionism. The Arab peoples are themselves persuaded that with the existence of a world socialist system the prospects for capitalist development, with its inevitable social, political and moral evil, cease to be a fatal inevitability for them. The help and support of the socialist community allow them to select the path of development that corresponds most fully to their national interests—the non-capitalist path, leading to the construction of a socialist society.

The Soviet Union provides Arab countries with economic aid of various sorts and, unlike the imperialists, does not pursue any mercenary goals in these countries. While the imperialists use aid to developing countries to strengthen their own influence in them, to subordinate these countries to their own rule, the aid given these countries by the Soviet Union is meant to develop their national economies and help to strengthen their political and economic independence. President Nasser said of this aid in 1970:

"Arab-Soviet friendship for our peoples is not a temporary phenomenon. It has become a constant factor and its influence is felt in the struggle for freedom and peace. It is fortified by mutual trust deriving from a deep understanding of the problems of the struggle that both countries are waging.... No matter how we are provoked we shall not lose faith in our cause. Whatever the methods of concealment and deceit, our nation is able to distinguish good from evil. In all this we receive great aid and support from all peace-loving forces, headed by the socialist states and the great Soviet Union, on which history has imposed the task of supporting the world revolutionary movement."

The character of Soviet policy with respect to the Arab world was shown especially clearly during the October War

in 1973. The Soviet Union again supported the Arab states whole-heartedly. In a special statement published on October 8, 1973, the Government of the USSR sharply criticised Israel's predatory policy and the outside forces that constantly support Israel's aggressive aspirations, came out resolutely for a just solution of the crisis, which is unthinkable without the complete liberation of all Arab territories occupied by Israel and provision for the rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

The USSR lent the Arab states unstinted political, diplomatic and military assistance in this period. President Anwar Sadat, in a message to the leaders of the Soviet Union published on November 9, 1973, stressed that he was happy to express the enormous gratitude of the Egyptian people to the Soviet Union for the aid and support it rendered at a time difficult for the Arab nation. He indicated further that the Soviet Union's defence of the freedom of the Arab nation, and its opposition to Israeli aggression and the imperialist forces supporting it, were valued highly in Egypt.

This support was yet another confirmation of the consistency and high principles of Soviet Policy in support of Arab's freedom and independence.

Soviet support of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the Arab countries and their attempt to strengthen their political and economic independence has laid a firm foundation for friendly relations between the USSR and the Arab states. The relations between the Soviet Union and the Arab countries both in the political and economic spheres are an example of peaceful coexistence, of friendly and mutually beneficial co-operation of states with different social structures. They are for the Arab states a form of international relations that are based on new principles, relations fundamentally different from those they had with the colonial powers that oppressed and exploited them.

The peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Government is based on Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence, which is a solid base for the further strengthening and development of the friendly relations that have been established between the USSR and the Arab states.

DECREE ON PEACE ADOPTED BY THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA

CONGRESS OF SOVIETS

Prepared by V. I. Lenin

October 26 (November 8), 1917

The workers' and peasants' government, created by the Revolution of October 24-25 and basing itself on the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, calls upon all the belligerent peoples and their governments to start immediate negotiations for a just, democratic peace.

By a just or democratic peace, for which the overwhelming majority of the working class and other working people of all the belligerent countries, exhausted, tormented and racked by the war, are craving—a peace that has been most definitely and insistently demanded by the Russian workers and peasants ever since the overthrow of the tsarist monarchy—by such a peace the government means an immediate peace without annexations (i.e., without the seizure of foreign lands, without the forcible incorporation of foreign nations) and without indemnities.

The Government of Russia proposes that this kind of peace be immediately concluded by all the belligerent nations, and expresses its readiness to take all the resolute measures now, without the least delay, pending the final ratification of all the terms of such a peace by authoritative assemblies of the people's representatives of all countries and all nations.

In accordance with the sense of justice of democrats in general, and of the working classes in particular, the government conceives the annexation or seizure of foreign lands to mean every incorporation of a small or weak nation into a large or powerful state without the precisely, clearly and

voluntarily expressed consent and wish of that nation, irrespective of the time when such forcible incorporation took place, irrespective also of the degree of development or backwardness of the nation forcibly annexed to the given state, or forcibly retained within its borders, and irrespective, finally, of whether this nation is in Europe or in distant, overseas countries.

If any nation whatsoever is forcibly retained within the borders of a given state, if, in spite of its expressed desire—no matter whether expressed in the press, at public meetings, in the decisions of parties, or in protests and uprisings against national oppression—it is not accorded the right to decide the forms of its state existence by a free vote, taken after the complete evacuation of the troops of the incorporating or, generally, of the stronger nation and without the least pressure being brought to bear, such incorporation is annexation, i.e., seizure and violence.

The government considers it the greatest of crimes against humanity to continue this war over the issue of how to divide among the strong and rich nations the weak nationalities they have conquered, and solemnly announces its determination immediately to sign terms of peace to stop this war on the terms indicated, which are equally just for all nationalities without exception.

At the same time the government declares that it does not regard the above-mentioned peace terms as an ultimatum; in other words, it is prepared to consider any other peace terms, and insists only that they be advanced by any of the belligerent countries as speedily as possible, and that in the peace proposals there should be absolute clarity and the complete absence of all ambiguity and secrecy.

The government abolishes secret diplomacy, and, for its part, announces its firm intention to conduct all negotiations quite openly in full view of the whole people. It will proceed immediately with the full publication of the secret treaties endorsed or concluded by the government of landowners and capitalists from February to October 25, 1917. The government proclaims the unconditional and immediate annulment of everything contained in these secret treaties insofar as it is aimed, as is mostly the case, at securing advantages and privileges for the Russian landowners and capitalists and at

the retention, or extension, of the annexations made by the Great Russians.

Proposing to the governments and peoples of all countries immediately to begin open negotiations for peace, the government, for its part, expresses its readiness to conduct these negotiations in writing, by telegraph, and by negotiations between representatives of the various countries, or at a conference of such representatives. In order to facilitate such negotiations, the government is appointing its plenipotentiary representative to neutral countries.

The government proposes an immediate armistice to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, and, for its part, considers it desirable that this armistice should be concluded for a period of not less than three months, i.e., a period long enough to permit the completion of negotiations for peace with the participation of the representatives of all peoples or nations, without exception, involved in or compelled to take part in the war, and the summoning of authoritative assemblies of the representatives of the peoples of all countries for the final ratification of the peace terms.

While addressing this proposal for peace to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, the Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia appeals in particular also to the class-conscious workers of the three most advanced nations of mankind and the largest states participating in the present war, namely, Great Britain, France and Germany. The workers of these countries have made the greatest contributions to the cause of progress and socialism; they have furnished the great examples of the Chartist movement in England, a number of revolutions of historic importance effected by the French proletariat, and, finally, the heroic struggle against the Anti-Socialist Law in Germany and the prolonged, persistent and disciplined work of creating mass proletarian organisations in Germany, a work which serves as a model to the workers of the whole world. All these examples of proletarian heroism and historical creative work are a pledge that the workers of the countries mentioned will understand the duty that now faces them of saving mankind from the horrors of war and its consequences, that these workers, by comprehensive, deter-

mined, and supremely vigorous action, will help us to conclude peace successfully, and at the same time emancipate the labouring and exploited masses of our population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation.

APPEAL OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO ALL MOSLEM LABOURERS OF RUSSIA AND THE EAST

November 20 (December 3) 1917

Comrades! Brothers!

Great events are taking place in Russia. The end of the bloody war begun to divide up others' countries is approaching. The rule of the robbers who have enslaved the peoples of the world is falling. The old walls of bondage and slavery are cracking under the blows of the Russian revolution. The world of arbitrary rule and oppression is witnessing its last days. A new world is being born, a world of labourers and liberated. At the head of this revolution stands the Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia—the Council of People's Commissars.

Russia is ruled by numerous revolutionary Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. Power in the country is in the hands of the people. The labouring people of Russia burn with one desire—to attain an honourable peace and to help the oppressed peoples of the world to win their freedom.

In this holy cause Russia is not alone. The great call of freedom, given by the Russian revolution, is being taken up by all working people of the West and East. Exhausted by the war, the peoples of Europe are already extending a hand to us, making peace. Workers and soldiers of the West are already gathering under the banner of socialism, storming the strongholds of imperialism. And distant India, the same India that the "enlightened" robbers of Europe have oppressed for ages, has already raised the banner of insurrection, organising their own Soviets of deputies, throwing off hated slavery, calling the peoples of the East to struggle and liberation.

The reign of capitalist plunder and violence is collapsing. The ground is burning under the feet of the imperialist robbers.

In the face of these great events we turn to you, labouring and deprived Moslems of Russia and the East.

Moslems of Russia, Tatars of the Volga and the Crimea, Kirghiz and Sarts of Siberia and Turkestan, Turks and Tatars of the Transcaucasia, Chechens and Mountaineers of the Caucasus, all those whose mosques and prayer houses have been destroyed, whose beliefs and customs have been trampled on by the tsars and oppressors of Russia!

Henceforth your beliefs and customs, your national and cultural institutions are declared free and inviolable. Go about your national life freely and without hindrance. You have the right. Know that your rights, as the rights of all the peoples of Russia, are protected by the whole power of the revolution and of its organs—the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

Support this revolution and its government!

Moslems of the East, Persians and Turks, Arabs and Hindus, all those whose heads and property, freedom and motherland have been traded for hundreds of years by the grasping robbers of Europe, all those whose countries the robbers who began the war now want to divide!

We declare that the secret treaties of the overthrown tsar concerning the seizure of Constantinople, treaties supported by the overthrown Kerensky, are now null and void. The Russian Republic and its Government, the Council of People's Commissars, are opposed to the seizure of alien lands: Constantinople must remain in the hands of Moslems.

We declare that the treaty on the division of Persia is null and void. As soon as military operations have ceased, troops will be withdrawn from Persia and Persians will be guaranteed the right freely to determine their own destiny.

We declare that the treaty on the division of Turkey and the excision from it of Armenia is null and void. As soon as military operations have ceased, the Armenians will be guaranteed the right freely to determine their political destiny. Not from Russia and its revolutionary Government does enslavement await you, but from the imperialist robbers of Europe, from those who have turned your native land into their own plundered and fleeced "colony".

Overthrow these exploiters and robbers of your countries. Now, when war and destruction are shaking the founda-

tions of the old world, when the whole world is ablaze with indignation against the imperialist usurpers, when every spark of resentment is turned into a powerful flame of revolution, when even the Indian Moslems, crushed and tormented by an alien yoke, are rising in rebellion against their enslavers—one must not be silent. Do not waste any time in casting the age-old oppressors from your lands! Do not let them plunder your ruined lands longer! You yourselves must be the masters of your countries! You yourselves must order your own life in your own image and likeness! You have the right to this, for your destiny is in your own hands.

Comrades! Brothers!

We are proceeding steadfastly and resolutely towards an honourable, democratic peace.

Under our banners we will bear liberation to the oppressed peoples of the world.

Moslems of Russia!

Moslems of the East!

On this path of the renewal of the world, we expect your sympathy and support.

**From A NOTE OF THE COMMISSAR OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE RSFSR, G. V. CHICHERIN TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES WOODROW WILSON**

October 24, 1918

We, for our part, would like to learn from you in detail, Mr. President, how you envision the *League of Peoples*, which, according to you, should crown the cause of peace. You demand independence for Poland, Serbia, Belgium, freedom for the peoples of Austria-Hungary. In all probability, you wish to say in this way that, firstly, the people must everywhere take into their own hands the determination of their own destinies, in order then to unite in a free league of peoples. But, strangely, we notice that you do not demand either the liberation of Ireland, Egypt, India, or even the liberation of the Philippines, and we would be very sorry if these peoples did not have the opportunity to take part in the organisation of a league of peoples together with us through their freely elected representatives.

**V. I. LENIN. From AN ADDRESS TO THE SECOND
ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF COMMUNIST ORGANISATIONS
OF THE PEOPLES OF THE EAST**

November 22, 1919

The subject of my address is current affairs, and it seems to me that the most essential aspects of this question at present are the attitude of the peoples of the East to imperialism, and the revolutionary movement among those peoples. It is self-evident that this revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop effectively, can reach a successful issue, only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism. . . . I must say that the Russian Bolsheviks have succeeded in forcing a breach in the old imperialism, in undertaking the exceedingly difficult, but also exceedingly noble task of blazing new paths of revolution, whereas you, the representatives of the working people of the East, have before you a task that is still greater and newer. It is becoming quite clear that the socialist revolution which is impending for the whole world will not be merely the victory of the proletariat of each country over its own bourgeoisie. That would be possible if revolutions came easily and swiftly. We know that the imperialists will not allow this, that all countries are armed against their domestic Bolshevism and that their one thought is how to defeat Bolshevism at home. That is why in every country a civil war is brewing in which the old socialist compromisers are enlisted on the side of the bourgeoisie. Hence, the socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism. Characterising the approach of the world social revolution in the Party Programme we adopted last March, we said that the civil war of the working people against the imperialists and exploiters in all the advanced countries is beginning to be combined with national wars against international imperialism. That is confirmed by the course of the revolution, and will be more

and more confirmed as time goes on. It will be the same in the East.

We know that in the East the masses will rise as independent participants, as builders of a new life, because hundreds of millions of the people belong to dependent, underprivileged nations, which until now have been objects of international imperialist policy, and have only existed as material to fertilise capitalist culture and civilisation. And when they talk of handing out mandates for colonies, we know very well that it means handing out mandates for spoliation and plunder—handing out to an insignificant section of the world's population the right to exploit the majority of the population of the globe. That majority, which up till then had been completely outside the orbit of historical progress, because it could not constitute an independent revolutionary force, ceased, as we know, to play such a passive role at the beginning of the twentieth century. We know that 1905 was followed by revolutions in Turkey, Persia and China, and that a revolutionary movement developed in India. The imperialist war likewise contributed to the growth of the revolutionary movement, because the European imperialists had to enlist whole colonial regiments in their struggle. The imperialist war aroused the East also and drew its peoples into international politics. Britain and France armed colonial peoples and helped them to familiarise themselves with military technique and up-to-date machines. That knowledge they will use against the imperialist gentry. The period of the awakening of the East in the contemporary revolution is being succeeded by a period in which all the Eastern peoples will participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world, so as not to be simply objects of the enrichment of others. The peoples of the East are becoming alive to the need for practical action, the need for every nation to take part in shaping the destiny of all mankind.

That is why I think that in the history of the development of the world revolution—which, judging by its beginning, will continue for many years and will demand much effort—that in the revolutionary struggle, in the revolutionary movement you will be called upon to play a big part and to merge with our struggle against international imperialism. Your participation in the international revolution

will confront you with a complicated and difficult task, the accomplishment of which will serve as the foundation for our common success, because here the majority of the people for the first time begin to act independently and will be an active factor in the fight to overthrow international imperialism.

Most of the Eastern peoples are in a worse position than the most backward country in Europe—Russia. But in our struggle against feudal survivals and capitalism, we succeeded in uniting the peasants and workers of Russia; and it was because the peasants and workers united against capitalism and feudalism that our victory was so easy. Here contact with the peoples of the East is particularly important, because the majority of the Eastern peoples are typical representatives of the working people—not workers who have passed through the school of capitalist factories, but typical representatives of the working and exploited peasant masses who are victims of medieval oppression. The Russian revolution showed how the proletarians, after defeating capitalism and uniting with the vast diffuse mass of working peasants, rose up victoriously against medieval oppression. Our Soviet Republic must muster all the awakening peoples of the East and, together with them, wage a struggle against international imperialism.

V. I. LENIN. From PRELIMINARY DRAFT THESES ON THE NATIONAL AND THE COLONIAL QUESTIONS

(For the Second Congress of the Communist International)

The age-old oppression of colonial and weak nationalities by the imperialist powers has not only filled the working masses of the oppressed countries with animosity towards the oppressor nations, but has also aroused distrust in these nations in general, even in their proletariat. The despicable betrayal of socialism by the majority of the official leaders of this proletariat in 1914-19, when "defence of country" was used as a social-chauvinist cloak to conceal the defence of the "right" of their "own" bourgeoisie to oppress colonies

and fleece financially dependent countries, was certain to enhance this perfectly legitimate distrust. On the other hand, the more backward the country, the stronger is the hold of the small-scale agricultural production, patriarchalism and isolation, which inevitably lend particular strength and tenacity to the deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices, i.e., to national egoism and national narrow-mindedness. These prejudices are bound to die out very slowly, for they can disappear only after imperialism and capitalism have disappeared in the advanced countries, and after the entire foundation of the backward countries' economic life has radically changed. It is therefore the duty of the class-conscious communist proletariat of all countries to regard with particular caution and attention the survivals of national sentiments in the countries and among nationalities which have been oppressed the longest; it is equally necessary to make certain concessions with a view to more rapidly overcoming this distrust and these prejudices. Complete victory over capitalism cannot be won unless the proletariat and, following it, the mass of working people in all countries and nations throughout the world voluntarily strive for alliance and unity.

**V. I. LENIN. From REPORT OF THE COMMISSION
ON THE NATIONAL AND THE COLONIAL QUESTIONS**

July 26, 1920

...The question was posed as follows: are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war? We replied in the negative. If the victorious revolutionary proletariat conducts systematic propaganda among them, and the Soviet governments come to their aid with all the means at their disposal—in that event, it will be mistaken to assume that the backward peoples must inevitably go through the capitalist stage of development.

**V. I. LENIN. From REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL
OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS, DECEMBER 22**

(The Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets,
December 22-29, 1920)

This circumstance... is steadily strengthening the alliance and the friendly relations between Russia and the oppressed nations of the East, despite the bourgeoisie's resistance and intrigues and the continuing encirclement of Russia by bourgeois countries. The chief factor in politics today is the violence being used by the imperialists against peoples which have not had the good fortune to be among the victors; this world policy of imperialism is leading to closer relations, alliance and friendship among all the oppressed nations.

**From A NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT
TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF FRANCE, GREAT BRITAIN,
THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA¹**

June 1, 1945

According to information received, at the present time military operations are taking place on the territory of Syria and Lebanon, and French troops stationed there have clashed with Syrians and Lebanese, conducting an artillery and mortar bombardment of the capital of Syria, Damascus. Damascus is being bombed by airplanes. Armed clashes are likewise taking place in some other towns of Syria and Lebanon. The number of killed and wounded is increasing daily. The situation is aggravated by the fact that the three states involved—France, Syria and Lebanon—are members of the United Nations and are participating in the conference being held in San Francisco.

The Soviet Government feels that the events in Syria and Lebanon are not in accord with the spirit of the decisions made at Dumbarton Oaks or the goals of the conference of the

¹ The note included in this collection is that sent by the Soviet Ambassador in France, A. Y. Bogomolov, to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, George Bidault. The notes to the Governments of Great Britain, the United States and China were analogous in content.

United Nations being held in San Francisco for the creation of an organisation to guarantee the peace and security of peoples. Therefore, the Soviet Government feels that immediate measures should be taken to end military action in Syria and Lebanon and to settle peacefully the conflict that has arisen.

**SPEECH OF THE DEPUTY PEOPLE'S COMMISSAR
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR
IN THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL ON THE QUESTION
OF WITHDRAWING BRITISH AND FRENCH TROOPS
FROM SYRIA AND LEBANON**

February 15, 1946

After what I have said on this score, I think I have the right to pass on to the so-called Anglo-French Agreement of December 13, 1945, which expresses the aspirations and common policy of Great Britain and France in regard to Syria and Lebanon. I do not intend to touch upon the substance of this agreement. But I want to dwell on a question which appears to me to be closely connected with the fundamental problem now being discussed by the Security Council: namely, the question as to what this Anglo-French Agreement signifies in regard to the sovereignty of Syria and Lebanon, and whether the sovereign states concerned can be satisfied with it in any way.

...The fact that Syria and Lebanon are members of the United Nations, should suffice to make it clear that the Anglo-French Agreement of December 13, 1945, which was concluded without their participation in any way, even without consulting them or asking for their assistance in settling the questions which concerned them, cannot be regarded otherwise than as a violation of the sovereignty of these states.

We have the statement of Sir Alexander Cadogan, who said of this Anglo-French Agreement, that, of course, it was not an ideal one. I think that Sir Alexander is liberal in the case in question. From the point of view of the elementary principles of international law, this Agreement is simply illegal, simply unfair in regard to the sovereignty of Syria

and Lebanon; of course, it is impossible to speak of any ideal in this case.

...I think we must satisfy the demand—I do not call it a request, for one cannot make a request in this case, but a demand, one which is justly presented on the basis of the state sovereignty of an independent, sovereign country—the demand of Syria and Lebanon that a decision should be adopted by the Security Council about the general, immediate and simultaneous evacuation of French and British troops from Syria and Lebanon. There is no other way out of the situation.

**From THE SPEECH OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR,
A. A. GROMYKO, IN THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL
ON THE WITHDRAWAL OF BRITISH TROOPS
FROM EGYPT AND THE SUDAN**

August 20, 1947

The growth of national consciousness in the people of the East led to the creation of a number of independent states in the Middle East. Egypt is one of those states. Like a number of other Middle Eastern countries, Egypt became an independent state and is now a member of the United Nations. It is trying to liberate itself from everything that limits its independence and is incompatible with its national sovereignty. As appears from the Egyptian Government's statements, this explains why it raised the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egyptian territory.

The people of Egypt consider that the continued presence of foreign troops on its territory is incompatible with its national interests as a sovereign state and with the principles of the United Nations which must be respected by all states which are members of this organisation. The USSR understands and sympathises with these national aspirations on the part of Egypt and its people towards an independent existence on the basis of sovereign equality with other states and peoples.

If we are to be guided by the high principles of the United Nations, the legitimacy of these Egyptian demands

cannot be disputed. To ignore such legitimate demands would mean acting contrary to these principles which require respect for and protection of the independence of states.

**NOTES OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO THE GOVERNMENTS
OF EGYPT, SYRIA, LEBANON, IRAQ, SAUDI ARABIA,
YEMEN AND ISRAEL¹**

November 21, 1951

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to declare the following to the Government of Egypt.

On October 14 of this year, proposals of the Governments of the United States, Britain, France and Turkey were published in the press, proposals that have been presented officially to the Government of Egypt on setting up the so-called Allied Middle East Command for the joint "defence" of the Middle East. It is likewise known that the proposals indicated were transmitted to the Governments of Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Israel and Trans-Jordan. On November 10, the declaration of the Governments of the United States of America, Britain, France and Turkey that was transmitted to the countries mentioned was published.

The proposals indicated envisage the creation of an "Allied Command in the Middle East", the stationing of foreign armed forces on the territory of Egypt and other countries of the Middle East, and likewise the stationing of the headquarters of this command on Egyptian territory and the placing at its disposal by Egypt, as by other countries of this region, of armed forces, military bases, communication facilities, ports and other installations. At the same time, these proposals envisage that the so-called Middle East Command be connected with the organisation of the Atlantic bloc.

From the proposals and declaration of the four states it follows that the goal of the states demanding the creation

¹ The note to the Government of Egypt is included in this collection. Analogous notes were sent to the other countries indicated.

of a joint command in the area of the Middle East is the inclusion of the states of the area of the Middle East in the military measures carried out by the Atlantic bloc under the pretext of organising the "defence" of the area.

As the Soviet Government has repeatedly stated in its official documents, the goals of the Atlantic bloc have nothing in common with the goal of defending its members. On the contrary, the facts indicate that this bloc is pursuing aggressive goals and is directed against the USSR and the countries of the people's democracies. Moreover, the goals of the Atlantic bloc contradict the basic principles of the United Nations, the task of which is the maintenance of peace and the establishment of friendly relations between peoples, and not the creation of blocs of states directed against other states.

The measures carried out by the organisers of the Atlantic bloc in Europe and other areas show that the Atlantic bloc is a weapon in the aggressive imperialist policy of its organisers, headed by the United States of America. In itself, this shows that the plan for the creation of the Middle East Command envisaged by the proposals of the four countries has nothing in common with supporting peace and security in the Middle East, nor with the genuine national interests of the states of this area. This is evident, too, in the fact that the organisation of this command is connected with broad plans for creating new and expanding present military bases in Egypt, Iraq and other countries of the Middle East, with the continued presence of foreign armed forces and also with the introduction of new foreign forces on their territories. This is contrary to the clearly expressed will of the population of these countries.

The implementation of the plan for creating the so-called Middle East Command would lead to the actual military occupation of the countries of the Middle East by the troops of the countries that have organised the Atlantic bloc, above all by the troops of the United States and Britain, and likewise by several other states, including Australia and New Zealand, 12,000 to 15,000 kilometres distant from this area. It is not difficult to see what such a situation would mean for the countries of the Middle East—some other countries that were subjected decades ago to occupation by foreign

troops still have foreign troops on their territory despite the legitimate demands of the peoples of these countries for the withdrawal of foreign troops from their territories.

The occupation of the countries of the Middle East by foreign troops and the creation on their territories of foreign military bases—in accordance with the plans for the formation of a Middle East Command—cannot but lead to these countries losing their independence and sovereignty and to their subordination to some major powers that are trying to use their territory, their material resources—oil, cotton, etc.—for their own aggressive purposes.

All the references to defending the countries of the Middle East are in fact only a screen concealing the involvement of Egypt and other countries of the Middle East in the military measures of the Atlantic bloc, measures directed against the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy.

In this regard, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to stress a fairly well-known fact: from the first days of its existence, the Soviet Government has sympathised with the national aspirations of the peoples of the East in their struggle for national independence and sovereignty. In contrast to powers that look upon the countries of the Middle East as their colonies, in 1946 the Soviet Union—following its invariable policy of supporting the just national demands of peoples both large and small—supported in the Security Council Syria's and Lebanon's legitimate demands for the evacuation of foreign troops from their territory. In 1947 the Soviet Union supported in the Security Council analogous demands made by Egypt. This policy on the part of the Soviet Union corresponds not only to the fundamental interests of the peoples of the Middle East, but also to the interests of world peace.

The Soviet Government has always steadfastly conducted a policy of peace. Concrete proposals for strengthening peace and security, proposals that the Soviet Union has made many times in the past and is making at present in the United Nations, testify of this: calling for an end to the arms race, banning atomic weapons, reducing the armed forces of the five great powers by a third, ending the aggressive war in Korea and concluding a pact of peace.

All this shows the absurdity of talk about the supposed threat to the countries of the Middle East, the usual subterfuge presented for creating the so-called Middle East Command. The real goals of the United States, Britain, France and Turkey are revealed by their proposals for creating this command.

The Soviet Government fully appreciates the position taken at present by the Government of Egypt with respect to the proposals made by the four governments; and the Soviet Government considers it necessary to draw the attention of the Government of Egypt to the fact that the participation of the countries of the Middle East in the so-called Middle East Command will inflict serious damage on the existing relations between the USSR and these countries. The Soviet Government wishes also to draw attention to the cause of maintaining peace and security in the Middle East.

**From THE NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT
TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES,
GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE AND TURKEY¹**

November 24, 1951

In connection with the appeal of the Governments of the United States, Britain, France and Turkey to the Governments of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Israel and Trans-Jordan on setting up the so-called Allied Middle East Command, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to make the following declaration to the Government of the United States.

As is apparent from the proposals contained in the aforementioned appeal, as well as from the statement on this question published on November 10 by the four governments and transmitted to the indicated governments of the Middle East, the Governments of the United States, Britain, France and Turkey envisage:

the subordination of the armed forces of the countries of the Middle East to the so-called Allied Command;

¹ This is the note sent to the United States. Analogous notes were sent to the Governments of Great Britain, France and Turkey.

the stationing of foreign armed forces on the territories of Middle Eastern countries;

that Middle Eastern countries place military bases, communications facilities, ports and other installations at the disposal of the above-mentioned command;

the establishment of contact between this command and the Atlantic bloc.

The proposals and declarations of the four governments testify to the fact that the plans for organising the so-called Middle East Command are nothing other than an attempt to involve the countries of the Middle East in the military measures of the aggressive Atlantic bloc. And some of the four states initiating the creation of the Middle East Command maintain their troops and their military bases on the territory of a number of Middle Eastern countries and are already increasing their armed forces there.

Thus, striving to involve the countries of the Middle East in the aggressive military measures of the Atlantic bloc, the Government of the United States, as well as the other initiators of the creation of the Middle East Command, intends to turn the countries of the Middle East into outposts for the armed forces of the Atlantic bloc. Only thus is it possible to assess the demand by the four countries, a demand directed to guaranteeing the presence of foreign armed forces in the afore-mentioned countries and, contrary to the will of the peoples of these countries, extending there the network of military bases of foreign states. It is not difficult to see that the implementation of these measures, which mean in essence the occupation of the countries of the Middle East by the troops of foreign states, is calculated to guarantee to the states initiating the proposal the possibility of constant interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East and of depriving them of their national independence.

The Government of the United States, as the Governments of Britain, France and Turkey, is attempting to justify the organisation of the Middle East Command by references to some threat that supposedly exists to these countries, and to the need to defend the Middle East. However, references of this sort are absolutely unfounded and cannot be considered anything other than an attempt to delude public

opinion and distract attention from the real aggressive plans of the four powers.

If one is to speak of a threat to the independence and sovereignty of these countries, such a threat comes precisely from the countries initiating the creation of the Middle East Command, countries that still do not want to reconcile themselves to the idea that the peoples of the Middle East, as all other sovereign peoples, have the inalienable right to conduct their own independent national policy, free of any external pressure.

The Government of the USSR considers it necessary to draw the attention of the Government of the United States to the fact that it cannot ignore these new aggressive plans, expressed in the creation of a Middle East Command in a region not far from the borders of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government also considers it necessary to state that the responsibility for the situation that may arise as a result of this will rest with the Government of the United States and other initiators of the creation of the afore-mentioned command.

**From THE STATEMENT OF THE MINISTRY
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR ON SECURITY
IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

April 16, 1955

Recently the situation in the Middle East has become significantly strained. This is connected with the fact that some Western powers have made new attempts to include countries of the Middle East in military groups that are being created as adjuncts to the aggressive North Atlantic bloc.

After the plan for creating the so-called Middle East Command fell through in 1951 due to the opposition it met with from the countries of the Middle East, the United States of America and Britain took measures to, circuitously, by ones and twos, draw the countries of the Middle East into one or another military group being created under their domination. Thus in 1954 the Turkish-Pakistani pact was concluded, and in February of 1955 the Turkish-Iraqi military alliance.

With the creation of the Turkish-Iraqi military alliance,

its organisers succeeded in cutting Iraq off from the other Arab countries and in straining relations between these countries, which helped only the aggressive forces striving to sow dissension among the countries of this region in their own military strategic interests.

Recently, things have come to such a pass that Syria is being given ultimata to join the Turkish-Iraqi alliance; such demands are accompanied with threats calculated to frighten the Government and people of Syria and to force Syria to alter its stand of non-participation in aggressive military blocs. Action of this sort and the role that the Western powers have allotted Turkey in the creation of military blocs in the Middle East cause legitimate fears in the Arab countries that Turkey will again aspire to hegemony over them and that a direct threat to their independence is being created. Egypt, too, is being subjected to great pressure to alter its negative attitude to the Turkish-Iraqi bloc and not to support Syria, which opposes foreign pressure.

The same demands are being made on Saudi Arabia, which, together with Egypt and Syria, opposes the participation of Arab countries in military blocs imposed by the Western powers.

The countries of the Middle East now stand in danger of losing their independence and being drawn into war for interests alien to them. It is completely understandable, therefore, that political circles in these countries are becoming ever more aware of this danger. Understandable, too, is the growing opposition with which the peoples of the countries of the Middle East meet attempts by foreign powers to force their participation in aggressive military groups. And if the ruling circles of some Arab countries are led about submissively by the organisers of these groups, this only shows how far they are from expressing the true national interests of their peoples.

As has happened more than once in the past, there are at present attempts to conceal the aggressive character of the plans of the United States and Britain in the Middle East with preposterous fictions about a "Soviet threat" to the countries of this region. Such fabrications have nothing in common with reality, since, as is well known, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is based on an unswerving effort

to guarantee peace between peoples on the basis of the principles of equality, non-interference in internal affairs, respect for national independence and state sovereignty.

The Soviet state, from the first days of its existence, decisively condemned the policy of imperialist aggression and colonial oppression, and annulled all unequal treaties that had been concluded by the tsarist government with the countries of the East.

The Soviet Government was the first to recognise Saudi Arabia as an independent state, supported the struggle for state independence of Yemen, Syria, Lebanon and the just demands of Egypt for the withdrawal of foreign troops from its territory.

In international organisations, the Soviet Government steadfastly supports the legitimate demands of the countries of the Middle East, demands directed to strengthening their national independence and state sovereignty.

A threat to the security of the countries of the Middle East really exists, but it issues not from the Soviet Union, but from those powers that, under the pretext of "guaranteeing security", create aggressive blocs in the Middle East, striving to reduce the countries of this region to the position of their own military-strategic springboards, and in economic relations to the position of colonies and dependent territories.

Naturally, the Soviet Union cannot be indifferent to the situation taking shape in the Middle East, since the formation of the above-mentioned blocs and the creation of foreign military bases on the territory of the countries of the Middle East have a direct bearing on the security of the USSR. The position of the Soviet Government should be even more understandable because of the USSR's proximity to these countries, while other foreign powers, for example, the United States, are thousands of kilometres from this region.

A decision not to participate in aggressive military blocs would be an important precondition for guaranteeing the security of the countries of the Middle East and the best guarantee against involving these countries in dangerous military adventures.

The Soviet Government, defending the cause of peace, will defend freedom, independence and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the states of the Middle East.

**From A TASS COMMUNIQUE ON THE PURCHASE
OF ARMS BY EGYPT**

October 1, 1955

From reports in the foreign press, it is now known that there has recently been increased pressure on some countries in the Middle East (Egypt) to purchase arms for their defence needs in Western countries mandatorily and on terms set by the Western countries.

The statements made by the Egyptian Government in this connection show that it regards this action with respect to Egypt as an intolerable interference that is damaging to the interests of Egypt's independence and legitimate defence.

On its part, the Soviet Government holds the view that every state has an integral right to take care of its defence and purchase weapons for its defence needs from other states on commercial terms, and that no foreign power is entitled to interfere or put forth any unilateral claims that could infringe on the rights or interests of their states...

**From A STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR CONCERNING
ANGLO-AMERICAN MEASURES IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

February 13, 1956

In the joint statement of February 1 of this year by the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the Prime Minister of Britain, Anthony Eden, on the results of the Anglo-American talks in Washington, several joint measures are stipulated, although the declaration is not specific enough as to their character. Nevertheless, it has already become obvious that these separate measures, planned without the knowledge of the UN and without the participation of the countries of the Middle East, cannot but create a threat to peace and security in the Middle East, and likewise cannot but violate the independence and sovereignty of the countries of this region; this contradicts the principles and goals of the United Nations...

The statement from Washington indicates, in particular, that the participants want to settle the quarrel between

"Israel and her Arab neighbours". That would be fine if it were true. But in that case, why were these decisions adopted without the participation of the interested countries, behind their back? However, well-known facts testify that there is a clear discrepancy between such declarations and certain activities of the Western powers with respect to the countries of the Middle East.

Moreover, reports have lately appeared in the press to the effect that certain powers intend to introduce their troops into the region in question, and these reports have not been denied. It must be supposed that this question will be clarified and declarations will be made that will alleviate the understandable concern of the countries of the Middle East—and not only of these countries—in connection with such reports.

The introduction of troops into the territory of the countries of the Middle East would be an act in clear conflict with the interests of strengthening peace and would create a seat of dangerous frictions and tensions in this region, and would make still more difficult the possibility of settling conflicts among the countries of this region.

...An act such as the introduction of foreign troops into the territory of the countries of the Middle East without the agreement of the interested countries and without the sanction of the Security Council of the UN, the organ bearing the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace, would be a crude violation of the UN Charter and the state sovereignty of a number of countries.

The Soviet Government hopes that its position will meet with complete understanding and support of all peace-loving states interested in the preservation of peace, security and the inviolability of the countries of the Middle East.

**From A STATEMENT OF THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR ON THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

April 17, 1956

The situation that is taking shape at present in the Middle East deserves the serious attention of all states and public circles that are interested in the strengthening of general peace and in the further reduction of international tension.

...Aspiring to secure the strengthening of peace and the development of international co-operation with regard for the just national interests of the peoples of all countries, the Soviet Government firmly opposes the violation of peace in the Middle East and all actions that could give rise to armed conflicts or could be used as grounds for unleashing such conflicts.

The Soviet Government considers it possible and necessary to avoid an armed conflict in the Middle East and considers that it is in the interests of all Middle Eastern states not to allow themselves to be provoked into military action.

The Soviet Government at the same time considers illegal and inadmissible, from the point of view of maintaining general peace, attempts to use the Arab-Israeli conflict for intervention from without in the internal affairs of independent Arab states or for the introduction of foreign troops into the territory of the Middle East.

From THE STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT ON THE SUEZ CANAL

August 9, 1956

The Soviet Government cannot ignore the fact that at present an ever more tense situation is taking shape in the Middle East. The Governments of Britain and France, as soon as the income of the Suez Canal Company was affected, resorted to crude and unjustified pressure on Egypt, applied economic sanctions to Egypt, stated that their naval forces had been put on combat alert and concentrated near the Suez Canal, that reservists had been called up, troops prepared for landing operations, etc.

...Undertaking actions that cannot but create a threat to the maintenance of peace and security, the Governments of Britain and France have stepped on a path that is at variance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations Organisation.

The Soviet Government considers those measures that the British and French Governments are now carrying out entirely inadmissible and views them as a challenge to the cause of peace.

It is completely clear that these measures cannot but arouse just indignation; they will be duly rebuffed not only by Egypt, but also by other peoples struggling for their sovereignty and national independence. Attempts to apply force against Egypt, which is exercising its sovereign rights, can inflict serious harm above all to the interests of the Western powers themselves in the Middle East.

The nationalisation of the Suez Canal does not infringe upon the interests of the peoples of Britain, France, the United States or other countries. Only the former Suez Canal Company, which obtained high profits from the exploitation of the canal, is now deprived of the opportunity to enrich itself at the expense of Egypt. Attempts to restore by means of force the lost privileges of this company or to force on Egypt the hegemony of foreign capital under another guise bear a clearly colonial character.

As to the invitation of the British Government transmitted to the Government of the USSR to take part in the August 16 conference in London on the Suez Canal, the Soviet Government, on examination of this question, must take note of the following circumstances.

...The conference planned for London is a conference of a group of countries that hold the shares of the Suez Canal Company with a group of countries selected by these main shareholders of the company.

The conference is being convened in circumvention of the United Nations, a situation that cannot be considered normal under the present circumstances.

The venue of the conference has been set for London without the agreement of the participants of the Convention of 1888, although if the stipulations of the Convention of 1888 were adhered to, discussion of questions connected with the functioning of the canal should take place in Cairo.

In connection with the above, the Soviet Government considers that the conference in question cannot be considered an international conference competent to make decisions with respect to the Suez Canal either in the composition of its participants or in its character and goals.

The Soviet Government considers it more advisable to discuss problems connected with guaranteeing freedom of shipping on maritime canals and straits of interna-

tional significance within the framework of the United Nations.

As is well known, there are a number of major maritime canals and straits of international significance. In the declaration of the three parties, the problem of the internationalisation of the Suez Canal is broached, but the question naturally arises why the Suez Canal alone is singled out from the no less important maritime straits and canals.

**From A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR AT THE LONDON CONFERENCE
ON THE SUEZ CANAL**

August 16, 1956

The present conference, unfortunately, is not sufficiently representative. In view of this it cannot in its present composition claim to resolve the substance of questions that can only be resolved with the agreement of all interested states, including Egypt, a state under whose sovereignty the Suez Canal lies.

The Soviet delegation not only has no intention of complicating the work of the conference, it will do everything in its power to help realise the goals of the conference, for the present conference can be of definite benefit. To ensure its success, it is necessary to adjust its goals, tasks and its agenda to correspond to the real situation. We view this conference as the first step along the path of negotiations and propose that all of us must try, on the basis of an exchange of opinions and consultations, to find an approach to settle the conflicts troubling many people at present, an approach that would be acceptable both to the Egyptian state and to other interested states. . . .

The Soviet Union does not have any special interest in the Middle East. It does not enjoy and does not claim exclusive rights or a privileged position in any country of the Arab world. The only thing that we want, to which we aspire and will aspire, is for the Middle East to be a zone of firm peace, and fruitful international co-operation.

**From A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR AT THE LONDON CONFERENCE
ON THE SUEZ CANAL**

August 17, 1956

No one can deny that from the point of view of international law the nationalisation of property located on territory to which a state applies its jurisdiction is a legal act. A state can nationalise property regardless of whether the owners of the property are citizens of that state or foreigners.

This principle of international law was supported, too, in a resolution of the UN General Assembly passed in 1952.

It is necessary to observe that the Suez Canal Company, created on the basis of a concession almost a century old, had a clearly colonial character. If we consider the spirit of the times, it is impossible not to admit that the existence in the middle of the 20th century of this sort of company, which was a "state within a state", is a remnant of the past.

Our times are marked by changes of enormous significance and scale. The era when individual powers proposed and disposed in the world, suppressing rights and not taking the interests of other states into consideration, is long past. A new era has begun. New independent states have arisen in the East. In keeping with the unprecedented growth of national awareness of peoples of this area, there has been a rise in their historical activity. All Asia, all the Middle East, is going through a period of great patriotic upsurge of peoples, an upsurge connected with the formation of new states that are now members of the United Nations. One must not underestimate the enormous force and great historical significance of this process. . . .

Voices are raised in the West to the effect that it is difficult to trust the present Government of Egypt and the head of the Egyptian state, President Nasser. If, however, international relations were based on whether one likes or doesn't like a political structure or the leader of some state, then obviously one cannot even consider the possibility of peaceful coexistence of states, or their international co-operation in accordance with the principles of the United Nations. Such an approach to international affairs is nothing

other than political interference in the internal affairs of another state. In the present instance, this serves as an excuse for trespassing on the rights of others, the property of Egypt.

The Soviet Government considers it useless to attempt to force on another people an internal order that, though perhaps pleasing to some foreign powers, does not enjoy the necessary sympathy and support of the people itself.

In this regard, I would especially like to stress one important aspect of the matter. It is no secret that certain circles in Britain and France are resorting to threats to apply force with respect to Egypt. By force they would like to impose on Egypt the plan for "international administration" of the Suez Canal if Egypt does not voluntarily agree to such a plan. Just so, the whole world now knows that military preparations are being made in Britain and France.

An attempt to force such plans on Egypt would signify the violation of peace in the Middle East. It is impossible not to see that this would not be limited to a minor conflict in the region of the Suez Canal. This could grow into a major conflict extending to the whole of the Middle East and, perhaps, beyond. Will Britain gain anything from this? After all, it is from this region and through the Suez Canal that a large part of the food for the population of Britain, the raw material and oil for British industry, passes; through the Suez Canal Britain's contacts with the more distant regions of Asia are maintained. Will Britain gain much from jeopardising its various interests in this region by attempts to force a regime in the Suez Canal Zone unacceptable to Egypt? Will France, its economy, its people, gain from measures of this sort?

Is it really not clear, moreover, that at present, when in vast regions of Asia and Africa dozens of new states have awakened to an active, independent life, when hundreds of millions of people in these countries are going through a phase of national upsurge and rebirth, that the rise of such a conflict could entail harmful and irreparable consequence for Britain and France, since an absolute majority of mankind would not recognise their actions as legitimate, would not reconcile themselves to aggression against Egypt in connection with Egypt's exercising its sovereign rights.

In the name of the Soviet Government I would especially like to stress here that the Soviet Union does not seek for itself any privileges or special advantages in the Middle East. We possess enormous natural resources over an immense territory, we do not seek to have concessions in the countries of the East or share in profits. Such strivings contradict the nature of our social structure. As is well known, we have long since abandoned our concessions, and recently decided to give up and hand over without indemnification to the Government of Iran our last oil concession in Northern Iran, Kevir-Hurian.

The main purpose of the Soviet Union in the Middle East is securing peace and calm in that region.

**From A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR AT THE LONDON CONFERENCE
ON THE SUEZ CANAL**

August 21, 1956

Unfortunately, in its present form, the proposal of the United States does not provide a compromise acceptable to all sides. If we dispense with certain expressions that embellish the substance of this proposal, it is scarcely an outline of international guarantees of the free movement of ships on the Suez Canal. It deals with the removal of the canal from the sovereignty, disposal and administration of Egypt, which is the master of the canal. In the guise of arguing for the "internationalisation of the canal", the same line that certain Western colonial powers long ago tried to force on Egypt is pursued. It is well known that long before the proclamation of the Egyptian Republic, certain Western powers tried to obtain Egyptian agreement to the prolongation of the 1866 concession until, for example, 2008, but that sort of proposal was flatly rejected by Egypt.

The proposed solution is a manifestation of the earlier policy. Instead of the hegemony of a single power over the Suez Canal, hegemony that Britain in practice exercised earlier, the hegemony of several foreign states over this canal is now proposed. . . .

As a result of the first round of work of the conference, two drafts are before us, drafts that reflect two approaches to settling the Suez question—the draft submitted by the United States and the draft submitted by India. At the centre of the American draft is the principle of depriving Egypt of its sovereign rights, of establishing—in the form of a concession—a colonial regime by way of creating a foreign administration of the Suez Canal, an administration that, as developed in the draft, would be a “state within a state”.

At the centre of India's draft is the principle of the strict observance of Egypt's sovereign rights, recognition of Egypt's unconditional rights to possess and administrate the Suez Canal, with a judicious combination of the interests of the international users of the canal with those of the Egyptian Suez Canal Corporation. The Indian draft envisages, in particular, the creation of a consultative body representing the interests of the users of the canal, a body provided with consultative and liaison functions. The Indian draft establishes definite forms of contact between the Government of Egypt and the United Nations on questions relating to the activity of the Egyptian Suez Canal Corporation.

For the future, it would be proper to agree to the creation of a preparatory commission composed of representatives of, for example, the following states: Egypt, India, the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union. An analogous proposal has been made today by the Indonesian delegation. The formation of such a commission would not place Egypt in an inferior position and would offer it an opportunity to take a fruitful and equal part in the body. The commission would itself determine its place of work acceptable to all its participants and could set to work without delay.

**From A MESSAGE BY THE CHAIRMAN
OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR
TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN**

September 11, 1956

The British and French Governments, apparently, intend to seize the Suez Canal, which passes through Egyptian territory and is under Egyptian sovereignty. But, Mr. Prime

Minister, I beg you to reflect on how this could end. It is scarcely possible to doubt that such action would lead to enormous destruction in the canal itself. No less destruction would ensue in the oil industries located in the countries of the Arab world and also in the oil pipelines that pass through the territory of these countries.

In this case all the Arab peoples would rise in holy struggle against foreign incursion. This means that the material loss, especially for Britain and France, and for all of Europe, too, would assume enormous proportions. There is no need to say that the delivery of oil to European countries from the Middle East would be completely upset. One can imagine what the loss would be in this situation to Britain, an island power, as a result of aggressive action against Egypt.

It is necessary, Mr. Prime Minister, to look the truth full in the face. If a foreign invasion were undertaken against Egypt, one cannot doubt that, besides the above-mentioned material consequences of such action, it would provoke the deep hatred of the peoples of Africa and Asia against those countries that had stepped on the path of aggression. I would hardly be exaggerating if I said that this hatred would make itself felt over the life of many generations.

My colleagues and I, Mr. Prime Minister, are convinced, that, in view of the existence of the United Nations, in view of the stormy upsurge of the peoples of the East who have stepped on the broad road of independent development and national rebirth, and in the century of atomic weapons, one must not threaten and rattle arms. In our times one must not act as one acted in the age of colonial oppression, when the colonial order was forced on the peoples of Africa and Asia by fire and sword.

Since the times have changed and the peoples of Asia and Africa have changed, any military measures directed against the sovereignty and territorial inviolability, in this case of Egypt, can only end in failure.

It is sometimes said that the Russians are inciting Egypt. But this sort of statement has no basis in fact and does not deserve serious attention. The absurdity of such statements is obvious at the very least from the fact that we learned of the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company from radio and press dispatches. Moreover, is it really not obvious that

from what the Soviet Foreign Minister said at London about the position of the Soviet Government on the Suez Canal, from what was said in the statement of the Soviet Government of August 9 of this year, and from my present appeal to you, that we not only are stirring no one up, but we are striving to further the peaceful settlement of this question with due regard to the interests of all interested states, of course with complete respect for the sovereignty of Egypt? We have said this to the Egyptians, too.

How can the Soviet Union support an unjust cause—pressure and threats against Egypt? How can the Soviet Union not favour Egypt's position if it is defending its sovereignty, its national territory and its inalienable right to this territory, a right that, by the way, no one disputes. It is, after all, a fact that it is not Egypt that is concentrating its troops and threatening someone with military action, but Britain and France that are concentrating troops and threatening to apply armed force against Egypt. In such a situation, how can one not be on the side of Egypt, if one is guided by the high principles of the UN? We proceed from the principles of the UN, we were and remain consistent opponents of colonialism.

This does not at all mean that we denigrate the interests of Britain and France as maritime powers. We fully understand your interests and have said so many times. But we proceed from the unarguable principle that the recognition of these interests should not infringe on the sovereignty of the Egyptian state. . . .

It is obvious that in Britain, as in France, there are certain circles that are inciting military action against Egypt. They are instigating unilateral action on the part of Britain and France, forcing a solution to the problem of the Suez Canal on Egypt by the force of arms. But we would not like to believe that these circles will have the upper hand, in view of the dangerous course they are urging on their own countries.

I must tell you, Mr. Prime Minister, that the Soviet Union, as a great power interested in the maintenance of peace, cannot stand on the sidelines in this question.

**From A MESSAGE OF THE CHAIRMAN
OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR
TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE**

September 11, 1956

It is, after all, clear to everyone that if France had had to mobilise an army of almost half a million against the unarmed people of Algeria, this has only exacerbated the situation; that if France and Britain begin war against the armed Egyptian people, who are struggling for the just cause of the defence of their national independence, the outcome cannot but result in especially serious consequences, above all for France and Britain.

We are not even referring to the fact that such a war under the present conditions could not but lead to severe destruction in the Suez Canal itself, in the oilfields of the Middle East and in Northern Africa, that it could not but cause enormous losses to all of Western Europe.

We are not even referring to the colossal moral and political loss France and Britain will bear if they unleash such an unjust war. One cannot doubt that the Arab population of all countries and all the peoples of Asia will naturally hate France and Britain, and it may take several generations to make these peoples overcome this feeling. It seems to us that this should be clear to all those who ponder the fate of France, which has given the world models of heroic struggle for the rights of a people, for human progress. . . .

One must not ignore the fact that, although the United States has called for the peaceful solution of the problem, the United States does not protest the concentration of troops and the threat to use them, that it clearly encourages advocates of force with respect to Egypt in Britain and France. . . .

It is clear to all that there are before us at present major questions, on whose solution depends the preservation of peace not only in the Middle East.

It is obvious that in France, as in Britain, there are certain circles that are inciting armed action against Egypt. They are inciting unilateral action on the part of France and Britain, a solution to the problem of the Suez Canal forced on Egypt by arms. We see that these instigators are again itching

to begin a war. Not to curb them means to step on a dangerous path. We would not like to believe that it is these circles that will have the upper hand.

That is why I consider it my duty to forewarn you, as a friend, of the grave consequences of such steps.

**From A MESSAGE OF THE CHAIRMAN
OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR
TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN**

September 28, 1956

We react positively to the fact that at the present time the Suez question is being discussed in the Security Council. We proceed from the consideration that discussion of this question in the Security Council can further its solution by means of negotiations between the interested parties. However, it must be noted that Britain and France, as is obvious from official statements, intend to obtain in the Security Council, contrary to the indisputable rights of Egypt, approval of a plan that envisages the establishment of foreign administration of the Suez Canal and also for a plan to create a Suez Canal Users' Association. It must be said bluntly that if Britain and France go to the Security Council with such intentions, it scarcely testifies to their desire to achieve an acceptable agreement by peaceful means, but testifies rather to the contrary. . . .

My colleagues and I would like once more to stress that the policy of military threats and attempts to intervene in the internal affairs of Egypt creates a threat to peace in the Middle East and is fraught with dangerous consequences. To attempt to realise these plans by means of force with respect to Egypt means to juxtapose oneself to the majority of countries, including those states whose security interests are directly affected by events in this region and who cannot remain indifferent when the violation of peace and aggression are at issue.

As before, we are convinced, Mr. Prime Minister, that there is a possibility of finding real ways to a mutually acceptable, peaceful settlement of the Suez problem. It is neces-

sary to use this possibility in the discussion of the Suez question in the Security Council. You can be sure that the efforts in this direction by the British Government and you personally will meet with full support on our part.

**From A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR IN THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL
ON THE SUEZ QUESTION**

October 8, 1956

British and French leaders have openly threatened to use armed force against Egypt. Sir Anthony Eden, for instance, emphasised in the House of Commons on September 12, 1956 that "military precautions were justified a month ago and they are justified today", and that "the government have no intention of relaxing them". G. Mollet did not hesitate to state in the French National Assembly that Britain and France intended to impose upon Egypt the settlement they desired. It should be noted that Mr. Dulles in some of his statements has also allowed for the possibility of armed force being used against Egypt by Britain and France. Things have gone so far that, quite recently, the possibility of military action against Egypt in connection with the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company was discussed at an emergency meeting of the NATO Council.

Economic sanctions play a far from negligible part in the anti-Egyptian campaign. The freezing of Egyptian assets in Britain, France and the United States, and the financial and economic boycott of Egypt were but the first steps in that direction.

Serious efforts were made to disrupt the normal operation of the Suez Canal by the recall of British and French pilots. It is now obvious that those efforts have failed. In response to the appeal by the Egyptian Government, volunteers from different countries have offered their services to the canal's Egyptian administration to serve as pilots.

At the present time, certain monopolists are drawing up truly sinister plans for large-scale economic aggression to strangle Egypt and turn the flourishing Nile valley into desert.

What is most paradoxical is that at this meeting of the Security Council Britain and France should be acting as the "prosecutors". Any unbiased person will, to say the least, be surprised at this fact. Indeed, an extraordinary situation has arisen—the Governments of Britain and France are accusing Egypt of the sins for which they themselves are to blame.

It is not Egypt that is sending its troops against Britain and France; on the contrary, it is Britain and France that are concentrating their troops in the immediate vicinity of Egypt and threatening to use force against it.

It is not Egypt that is resorting to economic sanctions against Britain and France, but Britain and France, together with the United States, that are applying and intend to continue to apply such sanctions against Egypt.

It is not Egypt that is recalling pilots and other personnel from the canal, thus disrupting its normal operation, but Britain and France that have decided upon disrupting navigation in the Suez Canal.

It is not Egypt that intends to close the canal, but the Western powers that are considering plans to blockade the Suez Canal and to reroute shipping around the African continent in order still further to aggravate the situation in regard to the canal.

It is not Egypt that is refusing to agree to a peaceful settlement of the Suez problem, but the Governments of Britain, France and the United States that have so far refused to negotiate with Egypt on a basis of equality.

In view of these facts, it is perfectly clear that it is Britain and France, rather than Egypt, that have taken the path of violating the 1888 Convention on freedom of passage through the canal, and that the complaint which Britain and France have submitted to the Security Council concerning Egypt is without foundation.

If anyone is entitled to appeal to the Security Council in the present situation it is certainly Egypt, which with every justification has complained to the Council of actions by France and Britain that constitute a danger to international peace and security and are a serious violation of the UN Charter....

What ways are there, then, of settling the Suez problem peacefully?

First of all, the policy of ultimata, military threats and economic pressure should be renounced. Egypt is an independent country and it has a right to demand respect for its sovereignty and national dignity.

Disputes should and can be settled only on the basis of negotiations on terms of full equality between the parties concerned. Hitherto the idea of any such negotiations with Egypt has been rejected. Those negotiations must now be begun. It is sometimes alleged that Egypt is being intractable, that Egypt refuses to meet the users of the canal half-way and rejects any idea of a compromise. But such allegations are belied by the facts....

Provided there is goodwill on the part of both Egypt and the users of the canal, it will not be difficult to come to an effective international agreement on the Suez problem.

The Soviet Government believes that the following principles could form the basis of such an agreement: first, freedom of passage through the Suez Canal must be ensured for the merchant vessels and warships of all countries on the basis of equality in regard to navigational and commercial tolls and to all conditions of shipping; secondly, Egypt, exercising its rights of sovereignty, ownership and operation in regard to the Suez Canal, would undertake to ensure full freedom of passage through the canal, security of the canal and its installations, maintenance of the canal in proper navigable conditions, improvement of conditions of navigation in order to increase the capacity of the canal, and to provide regular information to the United Nations on the functioning of the canal; thirdly, all parties to the agreement would undertake that in no circumstances would they commit acts which might infringe on the inviolability of the canal or cause material damage to its installations; the Suez Canal must never become a theatre of military operations or be subjected to a blockade; fourthly, the necessary co-operation must be established between Egypt and the users of the canal.

It will be recalled that, at the London conference, the Government of the Soviet Union and the Governments of Indonesia and Ceylon supported the draft submitted by the Government of India providing for the setting up of a consultative body for the Suez Canal which would represent the

interests of the users of the canal and would exercise advisory and liaison functions.

At the London conference, in August, the Soviet delegation expressed its views on the possible functions of such a body. This body might, first, provide advice to the Egyptian administration of the canal on the application of the principle of freedom of navigation and also on the question of tolls; secondly, render, whenever necessary, adequate assistance to the Government of Egypt in maintaining the canal in a proper navigable condition; thirdly, maintain the necessary contacts with the United Nations and the international organisations concerned with world shipping; fourthly, take measures to settle any disputes regarding the implementation of the agreement and, whenever necessary, refer them to the United Nations.

We do not, of course, consider this specification of functions exhaustive or final. With due regard for the requirements of the parties concerned, the functions of this body could be worked out in greater detail and more comprehensively. The machinery set up or the arrangements made within the framework of the United Nations to deal with the Suez Canal could also be defined much more precisely. This problem could be settled by the forthcoming negotiations.

And now the question arises how these negotiations on the Suez problem can be brought about in practice.

In our opinion, it is advisable that an authoritative committee of the Security Council should be set up for these negotiations.

**From A STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR ON THE REUNIFICATION
OF TANGIERS WITH MOROCCO**

October 9, 1956

The Soviet Union, respecting the just national aspirations of the Moroccan people and ardently sympathising with the cause of the independence and unification of the Moroccan state, welcomes the initiative of the Moroccan Government directed to the reunification of Tangiers with Morocco. The Government of the USSR expresses the hope that the confer-

ence convened in Fédala will not put obstacles in the way of the rapid and certain unification of Tangiers with Morocco, will remove the regime of the so-called international administration in the region, a regime that has infringed upon the rights of the Moroccan people. The Government of the USSR hopes that the conference will further the final resolution of the Tangiers question on the basis of full respect for the sovereign rights of Morocco in Tangiers.

**STATEMENT BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT
ON THE ARMED AGGRESSION AGAINST EGYPT**

October 31, 1956

Egypt has fallen victim of aggression. Israeli troops have invaded its territory and there is the imminent threat of a landing by British and French troops.

On the night of October 29, Israeli troops crossed the Egyptian border and began military actions, moving across the Sinai Peninsula in the direction of the Suez Canal.

The actions of the Israeli Government constitute an act of armed aggression and are an open violation of the United Nations Charter. The facts indicate that the invasion by Israeli troops was clearly calculated to be used as an excuse for the Western powers, primarily Britain and France, to introduce their own troops on the territory of Arab states, in particular in the zone of the Suez Canal. The Western powers cover their aggressive actions with references to the colonialist declaration of the United States, Britain and France of 1950, unanimously rejected by all Arab states. Acting as the weapon of imperialist circles, which aspire to restore a regime of colonial oppression in the East, the Government of Israel has thrown down the gauntlet to all Arab peoples, to all peoples of the East, who are waging a struggle against colonialism. The path that the ruling extremist circles of Israel have entered on is criminal and dangerous above all for the state of Israel itself, for its future.

Following the armed attack by Israel, the Governments of Britain and France on October 30 gave Egypt an ultimatum to place at the disposal of their troops key positions on

Egyptian territory—in Suez, Port Said and Ismailia—supposedly to avert hostilities between Israel and Egypt. Despite the fact that the Government of Egypt, defending its sovereignty and territorial integrity, rejected this demand, Britain and France directed their troops to land on Egyptian territory. With this, the Governments of Britain and France entered on the path of armed intervention against Egypt, crudely flouting the legal rights of the sovereign Egyptian state. Such actions by the Governments of Britain and France are at variance with the principles and goals of the United Nations, they are crude violations of obligations undertaken by the member states of the UN and are aggression against the Egyptian state. The Government of the Soviet Union decisively condemns the aggressive actions of the Governments of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt. Freedom-loving peoples of the world sympathise wholeheartedly with the just struggle of the Egyptian people, who are defending their national independence.

The Soviet Government considers that the UN Security Council, in order to preserve peace and calm in the Middle East, must take immediate measures to end the aggressive actions of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt and to effect the immediate withdrawal of the invading troops from Egyptian territory.

The Soviet Government considers that the governments that stepped on the path of the violation of peace and security, on the path of aggression, bear full responsibility for all the dangerous consequences connected with the aggressive activities referred to against Egypt.

**SPEECH BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE USSR,
A. A. SOBOLEV, AT THE SPECIAL EMERGENCY SESSION
OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE AGGRESSION
BY BRITAIN, FRANCE AND ISRAEL AGAINST EGYPT**

November 3, 1956

The Governments of France and the United Kingdom rejected the recommendations of the General Assembly, which offered the possibility of a settlement in the Middle East. They declared that they would continue their military ope-

rations against Egypt with a view of its occupation.

In defying the General Assembly resolution, which has met with the complete approval of all the peoples of the world, including those of the United Kingdom and France, those governments are hurling a challenge at the United Nations, at the fundamental principles of international law and at the conscience and honour of peoples. By wilfully ignoring the General Assembly resolution the Governments of the United Kingdom and France are dealing a fatal blow at the prestige of the United Nations, and have confronted our organisation with a serious crisis. . . .

The flames of war kindled by the aggression carried out against Egypt by France, the United Kingdom and Israel are threatening to engulf the entire Middle East and are jeopardising international peace and security.

The Soviet Union delegation calls upon the General Assembly, firstly, to condemn the armed attack carried out upon Egypt by the United Kingdom, France and Israel as an act of aggression incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations; and secondly, to call upon the United Kingdom, France and Israel again to cease hostilities immediately and withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory and Egyptian territorial waters. The General Assembly should also consider other ways and means of helping to halt this aggression. As a result of the aggressive action undertaken by the United Kingdom and France, the United Nations is undergoing a serious crisis. The Soviet delegation expresses confidence that the United Nations will find strength to overcome this crisis and to restore peace and tranquility in the Middle East.

**From THE NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT
TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE¹**

November 4, 1956

The Government of the Soviet Union has now received evidence of the declaration by the command of the naval forces of Britain and France that certain zones of the Eastern

¹ This is the note to Great Britain. An analogous note was sent to France.

part of the Mediterranean and the northern part of the Red Sea are closed to commercial shipping.

This action by Britain and France contradicts the universally recognised principle of the freedom of shipping in the open seas, which include the Mediterranean and Red seas; these actions are in substance the establishment by the Governments of Britain and France of a naval blockade of the coast of Egypt and a number of other Mediterranean states.

The establishment of zones closed to shipping in the Mediterranean and Red seas makes the use of the Suez Canal impossible and thus is a clear violation by Britain and France of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 on the Suez Canal. It is well known that, according to Article 1 of this convention, its participants, among whom are Britain and France, are obliged not to impair in any way the free use of the canal either in war or peace time. The Convention states that the right of blockade will never be applied to the canal.

The Soviet Government considers the actions of Britain and France as aggression, affecting the interests not only of Egypt, but also of other states. The Soviet Government cannot ignore these illegal actions of Britain and France, especially having in view that they were undertaken after an overwhelming majority of the members of the UN General Assembly, in discussing the question of the military actions of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt, expressed themselves in favour of an immediate end to the shooting and military operations and for the restoration of shipping in the Suez Canal.

Establishing closed zones that impede free shipping in the Mediterranean and Red seas, the Governments of Britain and France at the same time ignore the decision of the United Nations and proceed along the path of further aggravation of the situation in the Middle East.

The Government of the Soviet Union decisively protests against these illegal actions on the part of Britain and France and declares that responsibility for all the possible consequences of these actions rests with the British and French Governments.

**TELEGRAM FROM THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL**

November 5, 1956

Egypt has fallen victim of aggression by Britain, France and Israel. Egyptian towns and villages are being subjected to barbarous bombing. Landing operations and the direct incursion of the troops of the invaders on the territory of Egypt have begun. The casualties among the civilian population are mounting. Despite the decision of the special emergency session of the UN General Assembly of November 2 calling for the end of military actions and the withdrawal of all foreign troops invading Egypt, the aggressive war against Egypt is picking up.

The obtaining situation dictates the necessity of taking immediate and effective measures by the United Nations to suppress aggression. If at this decisive moment the United Nations turns out to be unable to curb the aggressors, it will undermine faith in it among the peoples of the whole world and its high ideals and principles will be crushed.

Being a champion of the peace and security of peoples, the Soviet Government requests the immediate convocation of a session of the Security Council to discuss the following question: "On the non-compliance of Britain, France and Israel with the resolution of the special emergency session of the General Assembly of November 2 and on immediate measures to curb the aggression of the said states against Egypt".

With the aim of taking rapid and effective measures to stop the aggressive war against the Egyptian people, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposes the following draft resolution of the Security Council:

"The Security Council,

"taking into account the fact that the resolution of the special emergency session of the General Assembly of November 2, 1956, which recommended to the Governments of Britain, France and Israel immediately to stop military action against Egypt and to withdraw their troops from the Egyptian territory, has not been fulfilled by the said states and military operations against Egypt continue;

"proceeding from the need to take immediate measures to curb the aggression unleashed by Britain, France and Israel against Egypt;

"proposes to the Governments of Britain, France and Israel immediately, but not later than 12 hours after the adoption of the present resolution, to halt all military action against Egypt and within a period of three days remove troops that have invaded Egyptian territory.

"The Security Council in accordance with Article 42 of the UN Charter considers it necessary that all member states of the UN, and above all the United States and the USSR, as permanent members of the Security Council with powerful air and naval forces at their disposal, provide armed and other aid to the victim of aggression, the Egyptian Republic, by sending naval and air forces, army units, volunteers, advisers, weapons and other forms of aid if Britain, France and Israel do not carry out this resolution in the time allotted."

The Soviet Government for its part declares that it is ready to make its contribution to curbing the aggressors, defending the victim of aggression, to restoration of peace by sending to Egypt the air and naval forces necessary for this purpose.

The Soviet Government expresses confidence that the member states of the United Nations will take the necessary measures to defend the sovereign rights of the Egyptian state and to restore peace.

I request you, Mr. President, to distribute the present declaration of the Soviet Government to all members of the Security Council and to all other member states of the United Nations.

**MESSAGE OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL
OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES**

November 5, 1956

Dear Mr. President,

At an anxious and crucial moment for the cause of general peace I am turning to you in the name of the Soviet Government.

A week has passed since the armed forces of Britain, France and Israel, obedient to the will of foreign forces, without any grounds, attacked Egypt, bringing death and destruction. British and French aircraft are bombing, with inhuman intensity, Egyptian airports, ports, installations, towns and villages. Anglo-French troops have landed on Egyptian territory. Enormous wealth, created by the labour of the Egyptian people, is being destroyed by the occupying troops, the number of human casualties mounts with every day. In the eyes of the whole world unfolds the aggressive war against Egypt, against the Arab peoples, whose only guilt consists in their defence of their freedom and independence.

The situation in Egypt demands immediate and most determined action on the part of the United Nations. If such action is not undertaken, the UN will lose its prestige in the eyes of the world and will fall apart.

The Soviet Union and the United States are permanent members of the Security Council and two great powers that possess all types of contemporary arms, including atom and hydrogen weapons. Special responsibility rests with us to stop the war and restore peace and calm in the Middle East.

We are convinced that if the Governments of the USSR and the USA firmly state their will to guarantee peace and oppose aggression, an end will be put to aggression and there will be no war.

Mr. President, in these threatening times, when the most elevated principles, the basis and the goals of the United Nations are being tested, the Soviet Government proposes to the Government of the United States close co-operation in order to stop aggression and further bloodshed.

The United States has a powerful fleet in the Mediterranean. The Soviet Union, too, has a powerful navy and air force. The joint and immediate use of these means on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union in accordance with a UN resolution would be a reliable guarantee that aggression against the Egyptian people, against the countries of the Arab world is stopped.

The Soviet Government calls on the Government of the United States of America to join their efforts with those of the UN to take decisive measures to end aggression.

The Soviet Government has already made a corresponding proposal to the Security Council and the special emergency session of the General Assembly.

Such joint steps by the United States and the Soviet Union do not threaten the interests of Britain and France. The popular masses of Britain and France do not want war; they, like our peoples, desire the preservation of peace. Along with Britain and France, many other states are interested in immediate peace and restoration of the normal functioning of the Suez Canal, which has been impaired by military operations. Aggression against Egypt has hardly been perpetrated in order to guarantee the freedom of shipping along the Suez Canal. The marauding war was unleashed in order to restore the colonial order overthrown by the peoples of the East. If this war is not stopped, it is fraught with danger and can grow into a third world war.

If the Soviet Union and the United States support the victim of aggression, other member states of the UN will join them in these efforts. This will significantly raise the prestige of the UN, and peace will be restored and strengthened.

The Soviet Government is ready to enter into immediate talks with the Government of the United States on the practical implementation of the proposals outlined above, so that effective action in the interests of peace can be undertaken within the next few hours.

At this tense moment of history, when the fate of the whole Arab world and at the same time the fate of the world is being decided, I await a positive response from you.

**MESSAGE OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL
OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR TO THE PRIME MINISTER
OF GREAT BRITAIN**

November 5, 1956

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to turn your attention to the fact that the aggressive war unleashed

by Britain and France against the Egyptian state, a war in which Israel has played the part of instigator, is fraught with serious consequences for the cause of world peace.

The special emergency session of the General Assembly has passed a resolution on the immediate end of military operations and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egyptian territory. Discounting this, Britain, France and Israel are increasing their military activity, are continuing their barbarous bombing of Egyptian towns and villages, have landed troops on Egyptian territory, turning its inhabited localities into ruins and killing civilians.

Thus the British Government, together with the Governments of France and Israel, has stepped on the path of unprovoked aggression against Egypt.

The motives advanced by the British Government to justify the attack on Egypt are completely without foundation. Originally, the British Government declared that it was intervening in a conflict between Israel and Egypt in order to prevent the Suez Canal from being turned into a zone of military operations.

After the Anglo-French intervention the Suez Canal Zone has become a zone of military operations and shipping along the canal has been interrupted, which harms the interests of the states using the canal.

Attempts to justify the aggression with reference to the interest of Britain and France in the freedom of shipping on the Suez Canal likewise cannot withstand criticism. We understand your special interest in the canal. However, this does not give you the right to conduct military action against the Egyptian people. At the same time, the Governments of Britain and France cannot assume for themselves the role of judges in the question of the ways to guarantee the freedom of shipping along the Suez Canal, since many other states that criticise the aggressive actions of Britain and France and demand the preservation of peace and calm in the Middle East are no less interested in this. Moreover, it is well known that freedom of shipping on the Suez Canal was fully guaranteed by Egypt.

The question of the Suez Canal is only an excuse for Anglo-French aggression, which has other and far-reaching

goals. It is impossible to hide the fact that an aggressive, robber war against the Arab peoples is now actually unfolding with the purpose of abolishing the national independence of the states of the Middle East and of restoring the regime of colonial slavery overthrown by the peoples of the area.

It is in no way possible to justify the fact that the armed forces of Britain and France, two of the great powers, permanent members of the Security Council, attacked a country that only recently achieved independent statehood and which does not have sufficient means for its defence.

What would be Britain's situation if stronger governments, possessing all forms of contemporary destructive arms, attacked her? After all, such countries at the present time do not need to send naval or air forces to the British shores, but can use other means, for example, missiles. If missile weapons were employed against Britain or France, you, no doubt, would call this a barbarous action. How is then the inhuman attack made by the British and French armed forces on an almost defenceless Egypt any different?

Deeply concerned by the turn of events in the Middle East and guided by the interests of preserving world peace, we consider that the British Government must heed the voice of wisdom and stop the war in Egypt. We appeal to you, to Parliament, to the Labour Party, to the Unions, to the whole people of Britain: stop the armed aggression, stop the bloodshed. War in Egypt can spread to other countries and grow into a third world war.

The Soviet Government has already appealed to the United Nations and also to the President of the United States with a proposal to use, together with other members of the UN, naval and air forces to end the war in Egypt, to curb aggression. We are fully determined to smash the aggressors and restore peace in the East through the application of force.

We hope that at this critical moment you will show sufficient wisdom and draw the proper conclusions from this.

MESSAGE OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL¹

November 5, 1956

Mr. Prime Minister,

The Soviet Government has already expressed its decisive condemnation of the armed aggression by Israel, and also by Britain and France, against Egypt, which is a direct and open violation of the Charter and principles of the United Nations.

At the special emergency session of the General Assembly, an overwhelming majority of the states of the world also condemned this act of aggression perpetrated against the Egyptian state, and called on the Governments of Israel, Britain and France to cease military actions without delay and to withdraw the invading troops from Egyptian territory.

All peace-loving people point with bitter indignation to the criminal activity of the aggressors, who have violated the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of the Egyptian state.

Discounting this, the Government of Israel, acting as a tool of external imperialist forces, continues its reckless adventure, hurling a challenge to all peoples of the East who are waging a struggle against colonialism and for their freedom and independence, to all peace-loving peoples of the world.

Such action by the Government of Israel clearly shows what all those false assurances of Israel's love of peace and its desire peacefully to coexist with neighbouring Arab states are worth. With these assurances the Government of Israel in fact has tried only to lull the vigilance of other peoples, while preparing a treacherous attack on its neighbours.

Being vitally interested in the preservation of peace and the maintenance of calm in the Middle East, the Soviet

¹ An analogous message was sent to the French Government on November 5, 1956.

Government is at present taking measures to stop the war and curb the aggressors.

We expect that the Government of Israel change its mind before it is too late and stop its military actions against Egypt. We appeal to you, to Parliament, to the labouring people of the Israeli state, to the whole people of Israel: stop the aggression, stop the bloodshed, withdraw your troops from Egyptian territory.

Taking into account the complex situation that has arisen, the Soviet Government has decided to instruct its ambassador in Tel Aviv to leave Israel and proceed immediately to Moscow.

We hope that the Government of Israel will understand and evaluate our warning in a suitable manner.

STATEMENT BY TASS IN CONNECTION WITH THE AGGRESSION OF BRITAIN, FRANCE AND ISRAEL AGAINST EGYPT

November 10, 1956

TASS is authorised to make the following statement.

Satisfaction is being expressed in the leading circles of the Soviet Union of the statements of the Governments of Britain, France and Israel that they have halted military operations against Egypt. This decision by the governments of these states shows that they have at last heeded the voice of wisdom and yielded to the demands of the peoples of the world, who have decisively condemned the aggression against Egypt.

Even two or three days ago, the situation in the Middle East was such that military action against Egypt could have spread to other regions. The reckless policy dictated by the narrow interests of certain circles in Britain, France and Israel created a threatening situation that could have led to serious consequences for all peoples, for world peace.

Noting that the end of military operations against Egypt is a positive step, concern is being expressed in leading circles of the Soviet Union that these steps have been under-

taken by the circles that unleashed the aggressive war against Egypt and are only a manoeuvre calculated to win time, a breathing space, so that even more strength can be built up in order to renew the aggressive war against Egypt and other countries of the Middle East on an even greater scale.

The basis for this concern is above all the fact that after the statements by the Governments of Britain, France and Israel announcing cease-fire, British and French troops subjected Port Said to severe bombing and landed new troops in this area. New destruction and new human casualties have been added to the destruction and to the severe material losses, and also to the already numerous human casualties, caused by the barbaric bombing of Egyptian towns and villages. Moreover, it is clear from the official statements of the British and French Governments that they refuse at present, under various pretexts, to withdraw their troops from Egyptian territory.

All this requires the peoples of the world to be on guard and to follow attentively the intrigues of the aggressors.

The people of the Soviet Union are unanimous in their condemnation of those guilty of the aggressive war against the Egyptian people and fully support the decisive measures of the Soviet Government directed towards ending the aggression against Egypt.

The Soviet people are deeply concerned about the fate of peace and well know what the widening of the military conflict could lead to if the aggressors are not driven out from Egypt. It decisively condemns all attempts to again force on the Egyptian people the yoke of colonial oppression by force of arms.

The Soviet Union was and remains a consistent advocate of friendship, co-operation and peaceful coexistence of states irrespective of their social structure. This policy stems from the very nature of the Soviet state, from the precepts of its founder, the great Lenin. But the Soviet people never were and will not be passive spectators of international brigandage when colonial powers try by force of arms to enslave states of the East that have become independent.

From A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR AT THE PLENARY MEETING
OF THE 11th SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY
ON THE QUESTION OF THE WITHDRAWAL OF BRITISH,
FRENCH AND ISRAELI TROOPS FROM EGYPT

November 23, 1956

Of the documents before us, those which are the most important and which call for immediate United Nations action are the report on compliance with the General Assembly resolutions of November 2 and 7 and the draft resolution of the twenty-one Asian and African countries.

The reports I have mentioned make it clear that, far from complying with the General Assembly's resolutions on the immediate withdrawal of their forces from Egypt, the United Kingdom, France and Israel apparently have no intention of doing so in the immediate future. A study of the aide-memoires drawn up by the governments of these three countries in reply to the Secretary-General's request inevitably leads to this conclusion. Instead of withdrawing their forces from Egypt, all three governments have put forward various conditions which would enable them to evade the execution of that task.

The United Nations now faces the most urgent task of taking effective measures to put an end to this procrastination and to obtain immediate compliance by the United Kingdom, France and Israel with the General Assembly's demands for the withdrawal of their forces. Only thus will it be possible to end the aggression against Egypt and to eradicate its consequences. It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of peace in the Middle East—and not only in the Middle East—largely depends on the fulfilment of this task...

The choice of the place and time for the military action launched by the two strongest colonial powers—the United Kingdom and France—and also by Israel, which has played a particularly invidious and, I might even say, provocative role in the sinister political game of the imperialist forces, cannot of course be attributed to fortuitous causes. There is incontrovertible evidence that this aggression was planned a

long time ago and formed an integral part of a comprehensive and far-reaching designs. It was with a definite end in view that a strained atmosphere was deliberately fostered in connection with the perfectly legitimate action taken by the Egyptian Government to nationalise the Universal Suez Maritime Canal Company. The manoeuvres of the reactionary forces in connection with this problem have unquestionably been the main source of international tension during the past six months....

The main purpose of the plans secretly worked out long ago in offices in London and Paris was to inflict a sudden and powerful blow on the resurgent nations of the Arab world in order to regain the positions lost by the imperialists and to crush the national liberation movement in that area.

Egypt was the first, but by no means the only, country included in these plans. The imperialistic plan was first to crush Egypt, whose resolute measures in defence of its national sovereignty had won the general respect and sympathy of the entire Arab world, and then to proceed further. The defeat of Egypt was intended by the colonisers to demoralise the other Arab states, and to pave the way for further acts of aggression, for the termination of national independence and the restoration of imperialist domination over the Middle East and North Africa....

Attention must also be drawn to the fact that the armed attack on Egypt occurred almost simultaneously with the attempt to stage a fascist putsch in Hungary. The aggressors obviously pinned great hopes on public attention being deflected from their operations as a result of the stir created by reactionary propaganda relating to events in Hungary.

Those who had prepared the aggression clearly counted on being able to wage a *blitzkrieg*, on completely crushing Egyptian resistance in a few days, thus confronting world public opinion with a *fait accompli*. However, their designs were thwarted by the heroic Egyptian resistance to the aggressors and by the powerful wave of resolute protests against their actions. They became convinced that their plans for a *blitzkrieg* were doomed to failure. The United Kingdom,

French and Israeli aggression took on the features of a typical colonial war with all its customary barbarous cruelty. . . .

Reports being received from the Middle East indicate that new forces are being concentrated in the area. The situation remains tense and this tension can be reduced only if the interventionists leave Egypt without delay.

The Soviet delegation fully supports the joint draft resolution submitted by the twenty-one Asian and African countries and considers it necessary to request the General Assembly to reaffirm its demand for the immediate and complete withdrawal of United Kingdom, French and Israeli forces from Egypt in the strongest possible terms.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR ON THE REUNIFICATION OF TANGIERS WITH MOROCCO

December 11, 1956

The Soviet Government, as the government of a country that signed the Convention of Algeiras of 1906 and also as a participant of the Paris conference of 1945, guided by the high principles of equality and self-determination of peoples, and respecting the just aspirations of the Moroccan people for independence and reunification of the country, declares that the Soviet Union extends full recognition of the sovereign rights of Morocco in Tangiers and in this connection considers that the international conventions on the regime in Tangiers have lost their force.

The Soviet Government is convinced that the end of the international regime in Tangiers and the restoration of Morocco's sovereign rights in Tangiers will further strengthen peace and friendship between peoples and the development of international co-operation on the basis of the principle of equality and mutual respect of state sovereignty.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics wishes the Moroccan people the greatest success in the matter of national regeneration and the prosperity of the country.

TASS STATEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE SO-CALLED EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

January 13, 1957

On January 5, the President of the United States of America, Mr. Eisenhower, sent a special message to Congress on the policy of the United States in the countries of the Middle East. In his message, full of anti-Soviet thrusts, the President, describing the present situation in the Middle East as "critical", demanded permission to use the US armed forces in the Middle East any time he considers it necessary without the permission of Congress as is envisioned in the US Constitution. The President of the United States also demanded to be granted full power to give military and economic "aid" to countries of the region in question. He has in mind, in particular, the expenditure of 200 million dollars in this region for "economic aid".

This action by President Eisenhower contradicts the principles and goals of the United Nations and is fraught with serious danger to peace and security in the Middle East. . . .

Declarations by the US President that the United States supports the sovereignty and independence of countries of the Middle East cannot be squared with the adoption of an aggressive programme that envisions the use of the US armed forces in this region. It is well known that the proposal to use the US armed forces in the Middle East goes considerably farther than the notorious three-power declaration of 1950 by Britain, France and the United States and the plan of 1951 to create the so-called Middle East Command, plans decisively rejected by the Arab countries, which justly saw in this a real danger to their national independence. . . .

The imperialist programme advanced by the United States testifies that the US Government has not drawn the necessary conclusions from the failure of aggression against Egypt. They clearly are trying to return to the bankrupt "from positions of strength" policy. All of this not only does not lessen tension in this region but, on the contrary, will lead to an aggravation of the situation, to an increased threat to peace

in the Middle East and is a flaunting of the peace-loving principles of the United Nations, principles that led the General Assembly to condemn the recent aggression against Egypt. In Mr. Eisenhower's message is heard not the voice of peace, but the voice of war.

In authoritative Soviet circles it is felt that the steps contemplated by the Government of the United States with respect to the Middle East, steps that envision the possible use of the US armed forces in this region, could lead to dangerous consequences, for which the Government of the United States will bear full responsibility.

NOTES OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES, GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE

February 11, 1957

As a result of unilateral steps on the part of certain powers, the situation in the Middle East has recently again become seriously aggravated. This aggravation stems above all from the fact that one of the great powers intends to use armed forces unilaterally in the Middle East, without the agreement of the United Nations, at its own discretion, for intervention in the internal affairs of this region. It is also intended to grant so-called economic aid to the countries of the Middle East with the condition imposed that these countries renounce all connections with certain member states of the United Nations, i.e., with the acceptance of political conditions for this "aid" that are incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries and with the high principles of the UN.

... The Soviet Government proposes to the Governments of the United States, Britain and France to work out and announce fundamental principles on the question of peace and security in the Middle East and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of this region. These principles could be placed at the basis of a joint declaration the adoption of which would exclude the possibility of dangerous, unilateral actions by any great powers with respect to the countries of the Middle East; these principles would further the strengthening of peace and security in this most

important region, would further economic development and would reinforce the independence of these countries.

As a matter of course, the declaration would be open for the adherence of any state interested in peace and security and wishing to arrange its relations with the countries of the Middle East on the basis of the principles referred to.

Proposals relating to the appropriate obligations of the powers participating in the declaration could immediately be brought to the attention of the governments and peoples of the countries of the Middle East.

Forwarded with this note are the fundamental principles comprising the draft proposed by the USSR for the Declaration of the four powers—USSR, USA, Britain and France. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs would be grateful for advice from the Government of the United States as to the acceptability of the basic principles outlined in this draft of the Declaration on the question of peace and security in the Middle East and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of this region.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE DECLARATION OF THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE USSR, USA, BRITAIN AND FRANCE ON PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NON-INTERVENTION IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE COUNTRIES OF THIS REGION

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Republic of France,

guided by the high, peace-loving goals and principles of the United Nations, as expressed in its Charter,

declare their agreement that at the basis of their policy with respect to the countries of the Middle East lies the aspiration for the establishment of peace and security in the Middle East and in the whole world;

recognise and respect the high principles of the relations between states formulated at the Bandung Conference of the countries of Asia and Africa;

will strive to create favourable conditions for the strengthening of national independence and state sovereignty of the countries of the Middle East;

express a sincere desire disinterestedly to further by their common efforts the economic prosperity of the countries of this region and in so doing proceed from the fact that the national resources are the inalienable national wealth of the peoples of those countries, which have the complete right independently to dispose of and use them in the interests of the development of their national economy and of progress.

The Governments of the USSR, USA, Britain and France *desire* to promote in every possible way the development of the economic, commercial and cultural ties of the countries of the Middle East with all countries on the basis of equality and mutual benefit;

consider that broad economic and commercial contacts of the countries of this region correspond to the interests not only of these countries but also of guaranteeing the economic well-being of other countries of the world;

recognise the need for a peaceful settlement of all international problems and conflicts affecting the Middle East through negotiations.

Conscious of the significance of the responsibility that they bear for the maintenance of peace and security in the whole world, the Governments of the USSR, USA, Britain and France commit themselves to observe in their policy with respect to the Middle East the following principles:

1. Preservation of peace in the Middle East by resolving conflicts solely by peaceful means on the basis of negotiations.
2. Non-intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East; respect for the sovereignty and independence of these countries.
3. Renunciation of any attempts to involve these countries in military blocs with the participation of the great powers.
4. Closure of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of the countries of the Middle East.
5. Mutual renunciation of the delivery of arms to the countries of the Middle East.
6. Furtherance of the economic development of the countries of the Middle East without the presentation of any political, military or other conditions incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries.

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Republic of France express the hope that other states, too, in their relations with the countries of the Middle East will observe the same principles.

From THE STATEMENT OF THE MINISTRY
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR APROPOS
THE BERMUDA CONFERENCE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
AND THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN,
HAROLD MACMILLAN

April 1, 1957

At the Bermuda conference questions were also discussed in connection with the situation in the Middle East. The main result of this discussion was agreement that the United States will actively participate in the work of the military commission of the Baghdad pact. Thus, the United States becomes a participant in this colonialist and aggressive bloc, created in order to enslave the peoples of the East. This is one more proof of the aggressive foreign policy course of the United States in the Middle East, a course expressed in the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine. If heretofore the Government of the United States has tried formally to dissociate itself from the colonial policy of Great Britain in this region and to appear as an opponent of the colonial order, at the present time the legend of the "anti-colonialism" of the United States, a legend zealously spread by US propaganda, is laid to rest. The mask is torn off and henceforth the United States will openly join hands with the old colonial powers, Great Britain and France, in their attempts to restore the colonial order in the countries of the Middle East. The practical adherence of the United States to the Baghdad pact is evaluated in just this way in the countries of this region. This policy on the part of the ruling circles of the United States expresses their aspiration to push aside Britain and France and to take over the former colonial positions of said countries in the Middle East.

It is, therefore, not difficult to understand why the governments of the Western powers have taken a negative stance with respect to the proposals of the Soviet Government regarding the adoption of a declaration on principles that should guide the great powers in their relations with the countries of the Middle East. The Governments of the United States and Great Britain do not want to renounce their policy of crude interference in the internal affairs of the states of the Middle East and as before view these countries as objects of colonial exploitation.

The Soviet Government for its part is convinced that in order sincerely to strive for peace in the Middle East and to respect the independence of the countries of this region, it is impossible to maintain a position rejecting such proposals as the joint obligation of the four great powers to solve all conflicts in the Middle East by peaceful means, the obligation not to intervene in the internal affairs of the countries of this region, to renounce attempts to involve them in the military blocs of the great powers, and mutually to stop the delivery of arms to them, to close foreign bases on the territory of these countries, to withdraw foreign troops and further the economic development of the countries of the Middle East without any political, military or other conditions incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries.

**From A NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

April 19, 1957

The Soviet Government notes that the Government of the United States has not expressed its readiness to accept the proposal of the Soviet Government that the four powers—the United States, the USSR, Great Britain and France—present a joint declaration or separate and analogous declarations on the question of peace and security in the Middle East.

...Rejecting the adoption of the principles of the Declaration and not advancing on its part any constructive proposals, the Government of the United States in effect refuses to seek an acceptable basis for settling conflicts in this region.

The Soviet Government, as before, considers it possible to secure lasting and firm peace in the Middle East through the joint efforts of the great powers—the USSR, the United States, Great Britain and France—on the basis of the principles outlined in the draft declaration and envisioning non-intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East and respect for their national independence and sovereignty.

The Soviet Government has consistently called for peaceful settlement of conflicts in the Middle East and for a search, jointly with other interested states, for mutually acceptable solutions to these questions. Since, as is evident from the notes of the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France, the proposals of the Soviet Government have encountered a negative response on the part of these governments, it would be necessary, in the opinion of the Soviet Government, as a first step in the direction of normalising the situation in the Middle East to agree that the four powers state that they condemn the application of force as a means of solving the unsettled problems of this region, since such an application is in gross contradiction of the principles of the UN Charter.

The Soviet Government is ready to review with due attention any ideas that the Government of the United States of America wishes to express in connection with the present note¹.

**STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR ON THE IMPERIALIST INTRIGUES
IN JORDAN**

April 29, 1957

Not long ago the world has undergone severe trials in connection with the aggression unleashed against Egypt. As a result of efforts by peace-loving states and the whole-hearted condemnation of this aggression by the United Nations, peace was restored in the Middle East; this created

¹ Analogous notes were sent on April 19, 1957, to the Governments of Great Britain and France.

conditions for the normalisation of the situation in this important area.

At the present time the situation in the Middle East has again become tense. This time the object of imperialist intrigues is Jordan. In the course of the last two to three weeks, crude pressure has been exercised from without on Jordan and the Jordanian Government, pressure accompanied at times by threats to dismember its territory and to deprive the Jordanian people of national independence, at times by promises of financial and other aid if Jordan represses the patriotic forces opposing the subordination of the country to foreign dictate. It is no secret that, after Jordan, Syria and Egypt, too, may become the objects of similar colonialist actions; these countries resolutely reject the notorious Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine and all attempts to draw them into aggressive military blocs, to undermine their national independence and subordinate their foreign policy to the plans of the colonial powers.

The situation that has arisen in Jordan cannot but provoke the serious concern of peace-loving states, among them the Soviet Union, whose security interests call for peace and calm in the Middle East.

...Instead of forestalling such a turn of events in Jordan and, by condemning the use of force, cooling the ardour of those who continue to rattle arms, the United States has itself sent its Sixth Fleet to the eastern shores of the Mediterranean; this is an open military demonstration against the countries of the Arab world that aggravates the situation even more.

...Events in Jordan are a typical example of the widely proclaimed Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine. Although not much time has passed since it first appeared, its true imperialist content has been made sufficiently clear. Yesterday Egypt, today Jordan, tomorrow, some other Arab state will be the object of imperialist conspiracy.

...The new aggravation of the situation caused by events in Jordan is fraught with serious danger. It can lead to serious consequences. It is a matter of course that the responsibility for the possible consequences of the situation that has developed rests with the Western powers, primarily the United States, which are aggravating the situation in the Middle East.

From THE TASS STATEMENT ON THE EVENTS IN JORDAN

May 25, 1957

Every day brings new facts that testify that the events in Jordan are a result of a conspiracy of colonialists who, relying on extremist, reactionary forces in Jordan, have set themselves the goal of breaking the opposition of the Jordanian people and forcing on it a new colonial yoke in the guise of the notorious Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine.

...The peace-loving, friendly policy of the Soviet Government with respect to the Arab countries clearly displeases the inspirers of the events in Jordan, since this policy stands athwart the path of the colonialists and those circles in the Arab countries that are ready to sell right and left the national interests of the peoples for the benefit of American millionaires.

The imperialists do not need peace and calm in the Middle East; they are trying to turn the Arab countries into their own military outposts, into a source of their own enrichment, into seats of permanent conflict and military provocation.

It is being said in the leading circles of the Soviet Union that the USSR is vitally interested in peace and calm reigning in the Middle East. As was said earlier, the Soviet Union cannot ignore the situation that has arisen in Jordan as a result of the intrigues of the imperialists, since the situation in the Middle East, which adjoins the borders of the USSR, cannot but affect Soviet security interests.

TASS STATEMENT APROPOS EVENTS IN OMAN

August 20, 1957

Events in Oman—an Arab principedom on the Arabian peninsula—are in the centre of attention of the public opinion of all countries. The people of Oman have risen to fight for their freedom and independence. The courageous struggle of the people of Oman against foreign colonialists has met with warm sympathy and support in all Arab countries and in the principedoms on the Arabian peninsula, in which colonialism still holds sway.

...British authorities are trying to justify military intervention in the internal affairs of Oman by referring to "old, traditional contacts" between Britain and the Sultan of Muscat, supposedly on whose request they have invaded Oman. These colonial "contacts", however, cannot serve as any basis for the intervention of British armed forces in Oman, an intervention that is a crude violation of the basic principles of international law and the United Nations Charter and scandalously tramples on elementary norms of humanity and morality.

It is impossible to recognise as just the robbery and plunder being carried out now by means of a colonial war against the peaceful population of a small Arab country—Oman. It is impossible to recognise as just in any respect at all the fact that in 1955 the British colonialists with the aid of the army of their henchman, the Sultan of Muscat, an army acting under the leadership of British officers, occupied the Arab principedom of Oman and tried to subject its people to their own dictates.

...Soviet public opinion, too, ardently sympathises with the just national liberation struggle of the people of Oman and resolutely condemns the intrigues of US and British colonialists, who are shedding the blood of the Arab people in the interests of enormous profits for the oil monopolies. The aspiration of the Arab people for liberation from dependence and for the achievement of complete independence is close and understandable to the Soviet people. Therefore, the Soviet people resolutely oppose any intervention in the affairs of the Omani people, who have the right to determine their own fate at their own discretion.

The events in Oman are transpiring on the eve of the opening of the 12th session of the UN General Assembly. The British and US colonialists take this into account and are trying as quickly as possible to drown in blood the national liberation movement of the Omani people, in order to finish the dirty colonial war that they unleashed before the opening of the General Assembly. They fear that their aggressive policy in the Middle East will be exposed before the whole world in the General Assembly. However, the colonialists will not be able to evade responsibility for their bloody crimes against the Omani people.

Events in Oman should attract the attention of the United Nations which is supposed to take care to maintain peace and security in the whole world. The duty of the member states of the United Nations is immediately to stop the intervention of the colonialists in Oman and stop their interference in the internal affairs of the Arab peoples.

From A NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN

September 3, 1957

The Soviet Government notes with regret that the Government of Great Britain not only has not declared its readiness to agree to the constructive programme to guarantee peace and security in the Middle East and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of this region, a programme proposed by the Soviet Government in its note of February 11, but has not even seen fit to accept the minimum Soviet proposal to agree, as a first step towards normalising the situation in the Middle East, that the four powers condemn the use of force as a means to settle the outstanding problems of that region. The adoption of this proposal by Great Britain, the United States and France would undoubtedly further peace and security in that area, bring calm and prepare the ground for peaceful settlement of unresolved problems.

The Soviet Government notes that the Government of Great Britain has taken a negative stand with regard to the proposal on the renunciation of the use of force in the Middle East and, not advancing for its part any concrete proposals that would lead to the normalisation of the situation in the Middle East, has at the present time again resorted to the use of armed force, this time in Oman and Yemen.

...In the note of the Government of Great Britain it is asserted that the primary source of tension is the Arab-Israeli conflict. This does not accord with reality. The basic threat to peace and security in the Middle East is created by the intervention of the colonial powers in the affairs of the countries of this region. A new and irrefutable proof of this is the British aggression in Oman and the shameful fact of

British bombing in Yemen, actions which can in no way be explained by the Arab-Israeli conflict.

There is no doubt that the Arab-Israeli conflict would not be so heated and that there would be real preconditions for its peaceful settlement if Great Britain, the United States and France repudiated the use of Israel as a weapon in their colonial policy.

...The Soviet Government, as before, considers that the first step toward normalising the situation in the Middle East would be a statement issued by the four permanent member powers of the UN Security Council condemning the use of force as a means of settling unresolved problems in the Middle East and repudiating intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of that region.

**From A MESSAGE OF THE CHAIRMAN
OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR
TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF TURKEY**

September 10, 1957

The Soviet Government cannot hide from the Government of Turkey its concern over the situation that is developing at the present time in this area—primarily around Syria. As is known, Syria and Egypt, defending their independent national policy, have for a long time been subjected to crude political, economic and military pressure from without. In the last several weeks this pressure on Syria has increased to a dangerous degree.

The mission of the American envoy Loy Henderson, that has taken place recently to the countries of the Middle East, was clearly dictated by the desire to organise armed intervention in the internal affairs of Syria from outside. As is known, Henderson's task was to organise a conspiracy against Syria and find a way to overthrow the national government of Syria and alter the situation in that country to the advantage of the major American monopolies and in line with the interests of the major colonial powers.

Certain circles in the United States would like above all to use such countries in the Middle East as Jordan, Iraq and, perhaps, others, to attack Syria. However, these circles are

forced to contend with the fact that, without exception, the peoples of all Arab countries nourish no affection for the Baghdad military pact and have no desire to serve the colonialists as do the governments of some of these countries. The peoples even of these countries, as is plain to all, are striving to be free of colonialism, to defend and strengthen their independence and sovereignty.

In this regard, as is openly bruited, Turkey is assigned a definite role in opening military operations against Syria. We, of course, would not like to believe this, but the matter is so serious that we see it fit to turn to the Government of Turkey on this matter and to share some of our specific considerations. The fact that there are signs indicating that leading figures in Turkey are apparently inclined to respond to this sort of plan is deeply disturbing to us. We will not hide that we were greatly troubled by the news of the concentration of Turkish troops on the Syrian border and also of the transfer of American weapons to Turkish territory for launching an attack against Syria. Is it really difficult to understand the purpose for which troops are concentrated when an unbridled propaganda campaign, full of inventions and provocative challenges, is being waged against the small neighbouring country on whose borders these troops are concentrated.

We are sure, Mr. Prime Minister, that you will agree that, for the Soviet Union, all these events are far from a matter of indifference. Considering the proximity of the Middle East to Soviet borders and considering Soviet state security interests, the Soviet Union naturally cannot ignore such a turn of events, a turn that could lead to armed conflict in this region, the more so as the danger to peace could in no way be limited only to that region.

The Soviet Government feels that the duty of all peace-loving states is to forestall such a dangerous unfolding of events. It would like, therefore, to appeal in the most friendly manner to the Turkish Government, in the name of maintaining peace in the Middle East, and also of world peace, not to take part in an affair so dangerous in its consequences as armed intervention against Syria, and to aid the forestalling of undesirable developments in the Middle East and the unleashing of an armed conflict in this region. After all,

not only the Soviet Union but also many other countries are now seriously concerned over the dangerous situation developing about Syria.

And when news is received of the concentration of Turkish troops on the Turkish-Syrian border, the question naturally arises for us how would the Turks feel if foreign troops began to concentrate on their borders.

We are firmly convinced that Turkey could bring great misfortune on itself if it were to be guided by the counsel of those foreign circles that are not at all interested in the maintenance of peace in the Middle East and that look only to their own profits, extracted by the exploitation of the riches of this region. We are sure that, if military action started against Syria and war were unleashed in the Middle East, Turkey would without a doubt only suffer as a result of participation in such aggression, and its position in this region would inevitably be undermined. It is impossible, too, not to consider the geographic circumstances in which such a conflict, involving Turkey, would arise.

In our view, calculations that it would somehow be possible to localise a military adventure against Syria are dangerous calculations.

**ANSWERS OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR, A. A. GROMYKO, AT A PRESS CONFERENCE
ON THE SITUATION IN SYRIA, OMAN AND YEMEN**

September 10, 1957

Question from the "Pravda" correspondent.

Could you say what is behind the campaign against Syria begun by the United States, Britain and Turkey?

Answer.

As you know, an anti-government conspiracy has recently been disclosed in Syria that was prepared by certain foreign circles. The conspiracy was intended to overthrow the existing Syrian Government and replace it with a reactionary puppet government that would suit the purposes of major foreign monopolies and would conduct a policy that corresponded to the interests of the colonial powers. The failure of this conspiracy drove its organisers into a frenzy.

... The organisers of the conspiracy are seeking more reliable executors of their plans. They are giving Turkey special attention in this regard, urging on her the role of a policeman *sui generis* in the Middle East. I would say bluntly that leading figures in Turkey, by all indications, are inclined to take this road, apparently little concerned that Turkey, proceeding along it, may find itself in an abyss. It seems to us that it would be dangerous for Turkey to be guided in this case by the counsel of those who wish to foist on her the role of executor of adventuristic plans for unleashing war in the Middle East.

Today the situation is such that Turkish troops are concentrated along the Syrian border and, along with political pressure and attempts to organise an economic blockade of Syria, there is a threat of armed intervention in the internal affairs of Syria. The question arises: how would Turkey feel if foreign troops concentrated along her borders?

The Soviet Government would like to believe that political figures in Turkey would show foresight and would not put Turkey in a position fraught with great misfortune for her. . . .

Question from the "Izvestia" correspondent.

Soviet public is showing concern in connection with British aggression in Oman. Could you say something about these events?

Answer.

British ruling circles are trying to present the matter as if the struggle of the Omani people has ended and that there is now no reason to discuss this question. However, such statements are calculated only to confuse public opinion and to evade responsibility for the continuing intervention in Oman. In reality, the national armed forces of Oman, as the representative of Oman in Cairo, Muhammad el-Harsi, stated recently, have not laid down their arms and are waging a guerrilla war against the invaders.

It is known that the representatives of Great Britain and of those countries that support Britain on this question, have not permitted discussion of the Omani question in the Security Council, a question brought up at the request of eleven Arab countries. Nevertheless, it is impossible to hide the fact that inhuman vengeance is now being wreaked before the eyes of

the whole world, with the use of jet planes, artillery and armoured forces, on the Omani people only because they want to take their destiny in their own hands, because they, as other peoples of Asia and Africa, want to attain a sovereign existence and national independence.

The imperialists would like this question, so unpleasant for them, to be passed over in silence. However, it is impossible to be silent—this would mean to approve their actions. The Soviet people have always raised their voice in defence of the right of any people, no matter how small, struggling for its independence.

Soviet people, as indeed all honourable people the world over, are deeply disturbed by the foreign armed intervention in the internal affairs of Oman. Events in Oman, one must suppose, will draw the attention of the 12th session of the UN General Assembly, which must intervene in defence of Oman.

Question from the "Krasnaya Zvezda" correspondent.

The Yemeni missions in London and Washington have made statements on raids by British bombers on towns and villages of Yemen. Could you give your opinion regarding the attacks by British armed forces on Yemen?

Answer.

Yemen has been an independent state for several decades. It is a member of the Arab League and the United Nations; it conducts an independent and peace-loving policy. Yemen refused to join the aggressive Baghdad pact and did not accept the colonialist Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine. This policy by the Yemen Government does not please the colonialists, who in violation of their obligations under the UN Charter are using armed force against Yemen and are bombing Yemeni towns and villages.

There is no need to say at length that the Soviet Union, in this instance, too, condemns the use of force with respect to a sovereign Arab state that is defending its independence.

It is to be supposed that all peace-loving states and the UN, which will shortly convene, will speak their word on this question and will defend the independence of Yemen.

**From A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR, A. A. GROMYKO, DURING A GENERAL
DEBATE AT THE 12th SESSION
OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

September 20, 1957

We should like to ask the following questions of those who are spreading fabrications about the Soviet Union's alleged intrigues in the Middle East.

Who is trying to lay hands on the natural wealth of the Middle East, the Soviet Union or the United States? The answer is clear. This is the work of the United States monopolies, and first and foremost the oil monopolies.

Who is plotting against the governments of the countries of the Middle East? For the answer to this question we need look no further than the recent statement by the Syrian Government.

Who is sending special envoys to the Middle East to put increased pressure on Syria and flagrantly interfere in its domestic affairs? The United States, not the Soviet Union.

Who is setting some of the Middle Eastern states against others, in an attempt to find submissive tools to carry out the plot against the independence of first one and then another Arab state? The United States is doing this.

If we turn to the facts, we shall see that they utterly demolish the arguments of those who seek to discredit the Soviet Union's policy with regard to the Middle Eastern countries; we shall also see who really is attempting to turn this region into a powder keg.

...How can the situation in the Middle East be improved? The Soviet Government's proposals in this connection are well known. They provide, in particular, that the Governments of the four powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the USSR, should renounce the use of force in the Middle East and all intervention in the domestic affairs of the countries of that region. I would ask you, what is wrong with these proposals? Why should we not declare our renunciation of the use of force and of intervention in the domestic affairs of the countries of that region? Nevertheless,

the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France have refused to accept these proposals. The Soviet Government considers that the approval of these principles in one form or another by the General Assembly might do much to improve matters in an area where the situation today is justly causing alarm.

**LETTER FROM THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR, A. A. GROMYKO, TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE 12th SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

October 16, 1957

One must be devoid of all sense of reality not to realise that Syria would not remain alone in its struggle against aggression. We know that the Government of Egypt has already declared it would give unlimited support to Syria if aggression were committed against that country.

It is known also that a number of other Arab countries have spoken in support of an independent Syria and of the necessity to give assistance to Syria if aggression were committed against it. Also on the side of Syria are the peace-loving peoples of other countries, in particular of the Soviet Union which cannot regard impassively the military provocations that are being planned in the immediate proximity of the southern frontiers of the USSR.

The Soviet Government has authorised me to state that it is highly disturbed by the alarming situation that is developing in the Middle East in connection with the developments in Syria. The Soviet Government believes that the unleashing of the armed conflict that is being planned in that area by the ruling circles of Turkey and the United States is fraught with grave danger to general peace. The United Nations cannot bypass such events, it cannot remain passive.

...The Soviet Government supports the proposal by Syria that the General Assembly should consider without delay the threat of an armed attack on Syria which would endanger general peace. The Soviet Government also supports the proposal that a special United Nations commission be set up forthwith to investigate thoroughly the situation on the Syrian-Turkish frontier. The commission should be requested

to submit its conclusions and considerations to the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations within two weeks.

Moreover, the Soviet Government, in view of the growing military danger in the Middle East and the need to take effective steps to put a stop to possible aggression, makes the proposal that, should Turkey break the peace on the Syrian frontier and attack Syria, the member states of the United Nations should immediately render Syria the armed assistance necessary to put a stop to aggression. The Soviet Government, for its part, declares that the Soviet Union is prepared to take part with its forces in suppressing aggression and punishing the violators of peace.

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to stress, furthermore, that in the interests of maintaining peace and of the security of the countries situated in the vicinity of the area in question, immediate action must be taken by states in case of the violation of the Syrian frontier and of the invasion of Syria by Turkish forces.

**From A LETTER OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR, A. A. GROMYKO, TO THE MINISTER
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FRANCE,
CHRISTIAN PINEAU**

March 1, 1958

Soviet public naturally can only be distressed by the events that are presently transpiring in Algeria, where for three years now the flames of genuine war have blazed without let-up. Sympathising with the national liberation movement of Algeria, Soviet representatives expressed themselves at the Cairo conference in support of the demands of the Algerian people. In our opinion, this does not damage the interests of France, in as much as these speeches touched only on the policy of colonialism, which has outlived its time, and which many leading figures of France herself oppose. As before, favouring the resolution of the Algerian question within the bounds of Franco-Algerian relations, we feel that further attempts by the French Government to solve this urgent problem by force

of arms leave ever less hope that its resolution will be found within the bounds of relations between France and Algeria.

The recent bombing by French aircraft of the Tunisian village of Sakiet Sidi Youssef, in our view, postpones still further the peaceful solution of this important problem. Is the use of force with respect to a sovereign state merely because that state is weaker really a method that member states of the UN can follow when conflicts arise in the relations between them? Does it not seem to you, M. Pineau, that this method runs counter to the UN Charter and will in no way further the settlement of conflicts?...

**TASS STATEMENT ON THE THREAT OF INTERVENTION
BY THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER WESTERN POWERS
IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LEBANON**

May 18, 1958

In connection with the events that have taken place in the last several days in Lebanon, there are reports of attempts by some foreign powers to use these events for intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon, for new pressure on the Arab states of the Middle East.

Facts testify that the said powers, using the Lebanese events, are weaving the web of a new conspiracy against peace and security in the Middle East. This time they have selected as the object of their intrigues the small Arab country of Lebanon.

...It is felt in leading circles of the Soviet Union that the solution of questions affecting the Lebanese state is the inalienable right of the Lebanese people and no other state has the right to intervene in these matters. Any attempts to use the internal events in Lebanon as an excuse for external intervention will create a dangerous situation in the Middle East and could lead to serious consequences not only for the fate of the Lebanese state and its independence, but also for the fate of peace in the Middle East.

In leading circles of the USSR confidence is being expressed that none of the powers will proceed to intervene in

the internal affairs of Lebanon, no matter which form this intervention might take, or will permit the formation of a dangerous military hotbed in this region.

**From A TASS STATEMENT ON THE THREAT OF MILITARY
INTERVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN
IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LEBANON**

June 24, 1958

There have recently been ever more frequent reports that the ruling circles of the United States and Britain are preparing armed intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon. Specifically, it has been proposed for this purpose to turn the group of observers sent to Lebanon by the United Nations into a UN police force. It is intended to increase the number of these observers significantly. In this way, dangerous plans for armed foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon are being nurtured.

It is known that these plans are bruited openly by leading political figures in the United States and Britain. Thus, at a press conference on June 17, the US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, declared that it was necessary to have in Lebanon UN armed force "somewhat larger in number and somewhat different in composition than had been anticipated at first". And Dulles openly stated the intention of the United States to send to Lebanon its troops in the guise of UN troops. He stressed then and there that American troops can land in Lebanon not only on the request of the UN, but also unilaterally. In other words, the whole world was informed that the United States may enter on the path of armed intervention with respect to Lebanon.

A day later, on June 18, President Eisenhower told representatives of the press that the United States was prepared, in connection with the events in Lebanon, "to take military action" and that the question of the measures to be taken would depend "upon the judgements of the armistice team and the Secretary-General" of the UN.

...Before the eyes of the whole world, American and British airplanes continually deliver arms and ammunition

to Lebanon. US and British troops are approaching the eastern shores of the Mediterranean. Ships of the American Sixth Fleet and British ships, including the aircraft carrier *Ark Royal*, are already close to Lebanon's shores.

The US Secretary of Defence, Neil McElroy, openly threatened to use atomic weapons against the Arab peoples. On June 19 he stated that he "would not hesitate" to use bombers in the Middle East with "hopefully clean" atomic bombs, if the US armed forces had to intervene in Lebanon.

It is no secret in informed circles in the Western powers that all such military preparations by the United States and Britain are being made in the belief that an operation for intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon can be carried out in the shortest time and thus present the world with an accomplished fact. In order to prepare public opinion in their own countries for this criminal act of aggression, different versions of the supposed interference of the United Arab Republic in the affairs of Lebanon are insistently spread in the official press of the NATO countries.

...The plans prepared for intervention against Lebanon show once again that the forces that have firmly hitched their policy to the continuation of the "cold war" and the increase of international tension view the Middle East area as an object of permanent imperialist intrigues and dangerous provocations. No sooner does one seat of these provocations vanish than a new one appears, no less and in fact more dangerous.

With respect to the threat of armed intervention in Lebanon by the Western powers, it is felt in the official circles of the Soviet Union that attempts by some governments to carry out, under one pretext or another, armed intervention against Lebanon is in flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations and is a mockery of those principles. The resolution of questions affecting the Lebanese state is an inalienable right of the Lebanese people and only of the Lebanese people. One internal event or another in Lebanon ought not to serve as grounds for external intervention in its internal affairs. Attempts at armed intervention by the Western powers in the internal affairs of Lebanon would inevitably lead to a serious aggravation of the international

situation and would be a serious threat to the cause of peace, and the full responsibility for this threat would rest with the organisers and participants of this intervention.

So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, as has been said a number of times, it favours peace in the Middle East, which is close to the borders of the USSR. Therefore, the Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to the preparation of foreign intervention in Lebanon this time, either, no matter how this intervention is disguised.

STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT IN CONNECTION WITH EVENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

July 16, 1958

On July 15, the whole world learned with indignation of the armed intervention by the United States in Lebanon. Ships of the US Sixth Fleet entered Beirut harbour and landed marines on Lebanese territory.

On the same day, the White House, in the name of the President of the United States, published a special statement that attempted somehow to justify this flagrant military intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon. It was asserted in this statement that the United States had sent its troops to Lebanon in order "to demonstrate the concern of the United States for the independence and integrity of Lebanon", which was supposedly "menaced from without", and also to protect American citizens in the country.

The utter groundlessness of such an assertion is completely obvious, in as much as no one is threatening the independence and integrity of Lebanon. This is affirmed with the greatest clarity at the very least by the statement of the UN Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, and the report of the UN observers on the situation in Lebanon. As to the "concern" for American citizens, one may well ask what norms of international law permit foreign powers to send their armed forces onto the territory of other states for such purposes. There are no such norms in international law. Everybody knows, however, that reference to the defence of a country's citizens is the favourite method of all colonialists,

from time immemorial, to justify a plundering attack on small countries.

The true reason for the US armed intervention in Lebanon is the aspiration of the oil monopolies in the United States and other Western powers to preserve their colonial rule in the countries of the Middle East, and also the obvious bankruptcy of their policy in the Arab world, the failure of the Baghdad pact and of the notorious Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine.

This is eloquently evidenced by the latest events in Iraq, events which, in the statement by the White House, are viewed as a cause hastening the armed intervention by the United States. However, events in Iraq are a new proof of the inflexible desire of the Arab peoples to liberate themselves from colonial dependence and take their fate into their own hands.

As is known, on the night of July 13-14, in Iraq, as a result of a rising by the army, supported by the people, the monarchical regime was overthrown, a republic proclaimed and the Government of the Iraqi Republic formed.

The first foreign policy acts of this government, headed by General Abdul Karim Kassem, were declarations of complete support for the principles of the Bandung Conference, of the withdrawal of Iraq from the aggressive, military Baghdad pact, and likewise of the recognition of the United Arab Republic.

The Government of the Iraqi Republic stated that it will "act in accordance with the principles of the UN", "will conduct an Arab policy and strictly observe the resolutions of the Bandung Conference" and that it is ready "to adhere to the obligations and treaties that proceed from the interests of the country". It also declared that it guaranteed the security of foreign citizens and the inviolability of their property.

These actions testify to the intention of the government to defend the national independence of the country and, together with other freedom-loving Arab peoples, wage a struggle to overcome the severe consequences of colonialism, develop the national economy and raise the standard of living of the people.

It is natural that the Iraqi Government's statement of its programme, which meets the aspirations of the Iraqi and all

other Arab peoples, should receive wholehearted support both in Arab states and in all peace-loving countries, which consider the creation of the republic wholly an internal affair of the people of Iraq.

This turn of events in the Middle East clearly does not suit the colonial powers, who reacted to the creation of the Iraqi Republic with unconcealed hostility. Feverish activity began immediately in Washington, London and Ankara.

The existence of plans for large-scale intervention by the colonial powers in the internal affairs of the countries of the Arab world is evidenced, in particular, by the statement of the British Foreign Minister, Selwyn Lloyd, that the British Government had prior information of the intent of the US Government with respect to the landing of troops in Lebanon, that the British Government fully supported this action by the United States and that British armed forces in this region were on the alert.

In order to create a pretext for armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Arab countries, a statement was elicited from the President of Lebanon, Chamoun, who appealed to the Governments of the United States, Britain and France to land troops in Lebanon. It is well known, however, that in Lebanon events are transpiring that are caused purely by internal developments and only the intervention of the countries of the Baghdad pact and the United States, striving to preserve the anti-national regime at all costs, led to civil war and to the aggravation of the whole situation in this area.

One must observe that the landing of US troops in Beirut is an act of armed intervention not only with respect to Lebanon, but also with respect to all freedom-loving Arab countries. This is specifically and unambiguously pointed out in the above-mentioned statement of the White House, a declaration in which the dispatch of troops to Lebanon, not coincidentally, is connected directly with events in Iraq. This is testified also by the fact that the King of Jordan, Hussein, clearly on the advice of his sponsors, declared himself the head of the no-longer-extant Iraqi-Jordanian federation in place of King Faisal, overthrown by the Iraqi people, although Hussein had no reason to do so in form or substance. The provocative sense of this step is completely obvious. Hussein

and his patrons do not wish to take into account the fact that the Government of the Republic of Iraq, supported by the whole people, officially declared its withdrawal from the Iraqi-Jordanian federation.

The US armed intervention in Lebanon has made it completely obvious that the imperialists have thrown aside their mask and have proceeded to open aggression against the peace-loving Arab peoples. In this connection it becomes completely clear why the Government of the United States did not accept the proposal of February 11, 1957 by the Soviet Government on the non-intervention of the great powers in the internal affairs of the countries of this region. The US Government refused to assume obligations whose implementation would have guaranteed the preservation of peace and the lessening of tension in this part of the world. It wished to have a free hand for its aggressive actions in this area.

The armed intervention by the United States in Lebanon creates a serious threat to peace and is fraught with far-reaching consequences. The peoples of the world cannot remain indifferent in the face of this insolent imperialist aggression and most flagrant trampling of the sovereignty and national independence of the Arab countries and the unceremonious violation of the principles of the UN.

The reference of the White House to the fact that American troops were introduced onto the territory of Lebanon supposedly for self-defence and in the national interests of the United States is an open mockery of these principles. Who does not know that the United States is many thousands of kilometres from Lebanon and that the people of Lebanon and other Arab countries can in no way threaten the national interests and security of the United States. So far as Lebanon itself is concerned, it is precisely American armed intervention that represents the main threat to the independence of this small Arab country.

Having entered the path of flagrant violation of the UN Charter, the Government of the United States is now trying to present the Security Council and the whole United Nations with an accomplished fact and through pressure is trying to obtain approval from the UN of its unilateral aggressive actions.

The Soviet Government feels that the developments in the Middle East as a result of the open aggression by the United States, supported by other colonial powers, have created a very alarming and dangerous situation for world peace. Under these conditions the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations must take the most urgent and decisive measures to stop the aggression and defend the national independence of the Arab states which are subjected to unprovoked attack.

The Soviet Government insistently calls on the Government of the United States to halt its armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Arab countries and immediately to withdraw its troops from Lebanon.

The Soviet Government declares that the Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to events that are creating a serious threat in an area adjacent to its borders and reserves the right to take the necessary measures dictated by the interests of preserving peace and security.

STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE AGGRESSION BY THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN IN THE MIDDLE EAST

July 18, 1958

On July 17, the Government of Great Britain perpetrated an act of armed aggression against the people of Jordan—British paratroop units landed in the capital of Jordan, Amman.

Trying to justify open military intervention in the affairs of this Arab state, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Harold Macmillan, gave assurances in the House of Commons that this was undertaken supposedly to help the Government of Jordan "to resist aggression", although, as is well known, no one is threatening Jordan and there are no facts or information that would indicate the existence of a threat, nor could the British Prime Minister adduce any. The Prime Minister stated further that these actions by the Government of Great Britain have the full support and approval of the United States Government. Thus the British

Government supports the aggression by the United States and the United States Government supports aggression by Great Britain.

The armed intervention by Great Britain in Jordan, undertaken after the American aggression against Lebanon, testifies to a broad plan conceived by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain of aggressive actions to suppress the national liberation movement in the countries of the Arab world. They wish to force colonial rule on the Arab peoples again for the American and British monopolies to plunder the natural and human resources of these countries.

Having decided on military intervention in Jordan, the ruling circles of Great Britain, in the guise of aiding King Hussein, are trying to restore their colonial position in the country, lost to a significant degree in 1956, when, on the demand of the Jordanian people, British military advisors, headed by Glubb Pasha, who had had effective control over the Jordanian army, were driven out of the country.

From the statement by the British Prime Minister, it is evident that the purpose of the armed intervention by Great Britain in Jordan is not only to suppress the movement of the Jordanian people for their independence, but, consolidating her position in Jordan, to use this country, along with Lebanon, occupied by American troops, as a springboard for the suppression of the people's revolution in Iraq. At present frenzied efforts are being made in the United States and Great Britain to prepare public opinion for a further increase in the scale of Anglo-American military intervention against the states of the Arab world.

It is impossible not to see that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain have stepped on the path of armed intervention in the internal affairs of other states, which is categorically forbidden by international law and the UN Charter. This path of military adventure is fraught with the most serious consequences for the cause of peace, and those who step on this path cannot but be aware that the peoples hold them answerable for these aggressive actions. The Government of Great Britain should be well aware, especially after the shameful failure of the military adventure against Egypt, that the time has long passed when

it was possible to suppress an uprising of oppressed peoples and preserve the colonial order with colonialist gun boats and the landing of armed detachments in a colony or dependent country. Now that hundreds of millions of previously oppressed colonial peoples have risen in the fight for their national rights, any attempts to hinder these peoples in the achievement of their independence is doomed to failure. The holy right of people to order their destiny as they choose is proclaimed in the United Nations Charter, which is signed by the United States and Great Britain, too.

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain have trampled on their obligations to the United Nations and have emerged as violators of peace.

The aggressors ought not to forget that all peoples, especially the Moslem population in the countries of the Arab world and the regions adjacent to it, will not remain indifferent to the fate of the peoples who have been victimised by foreign armed intervention. The peoples of the Arab world are not alone in their fight for independence and freedom against the criminal actions of the Anglo-American colonialists.

The peoples of all countries angrily and indignantly condemn the Anglo-American aggressors. Throughout the world, including Great Britain herself, there is a wave of resolute protest against the bloody adventures of the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain in the Middle East. The people demand an immediate end to the armed intervention of the United States and Great Britain and the withdrawal of American and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan.

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain have perpetrated hostile acts against peace and they bear the responsibility for the consequences of the acts of aggression undertaken by them in Lebanon and Jordan.

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain must cease armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Arab countries and immediately withdraw their troops from Lebanon and Jordan.

The Soviet Government believes that at this crucial moment the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations must fulfil their obligation to maintain peace,

end aggression, defend the national independence of the Arab states, which have been subjected to unprovoked attack, and quell the hotbed of war.

The Soviet Government declares that the Soviet Union will not remain indifferent to acts of unprovoked aggression in an area adjacent to its borders, and it will have to take the necessary measures dictated by the security interests of the Soviet Union and in the interest of preserving world peace.

**From A MEMORANDUM OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF TURKEY**

July 24, 1958

Evidence from all sources indicates that for the last several days the Government of Turkey has been preparing to begin military operations against Iraq and that the formal grounds for effecting the incursion of Turkish troops into Iraq may be a corresponding appeal from King Hussein. It is a matter of course that, in as much as the aggressive actions of Turkey will inevitably meet with active opposition from the Iraqi and other Arab peoples, the Turkish Government could not implement these actions without the direct support of the United States of America.

Obviously, only the lack of complete agreement with the United States with respect to this adventure, and the determined protests of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states with respect to the interventions begun against Lebanon and Jordan, and the attack being prepared against Iraq and other Arab states, protests with serious warnings to the aggressors, have so far prevented the implementation of plans prepared for the incursion of Turkish troops into Iraq.

Nevertheless, the situation in this region remains dangerous. The threat of aggression against Iraq has not been removed. According to the available evidence, reservists are being called up in Turkey, Turkish army units are concentrating in Diyarbakir and are being sent to the borders of Syria and Iraq, although, as is known, neither Syria nor Iraq is threatening Turkey.

The Soviet Government considers it its duty to warn the Turkish Government of its grave responsibility for the possible consequences of the unleashing of a military conflict in this region. The Soviet Government would like to hope that Turkey will not join the ranks of the aggressors and neither in word nor deed permit any steps that would lead to an aggravation of the situation in the Middle East.

**From A NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY**

July 26, 1958

In the last few days, evidence has come to light that shows that the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany has become one of the outposts that the US military command is using to carry out armed intervention against the Arab countries. American aircraft with detachments of paratroopers are being moved from the territory of West Germany to the area of aggression in the Middle East. In particular, all units of the First Airborne Combat Group of the 24th Division stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany have been conveyed there. According to the report of the headquarters of the US Air Force in Wiesbaden, this operation was begun from Furstenfeldbrück. The Frankfurt airfield Rhein-Main has been turned into a transit point for US military transport planes air-lifting American troops and arms to the Middle East.

...The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany cannot but bear responsibility for actions in complicity with aggression in the Middle East.

The Soviet Government calls on the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to take effective measures so that the FRG territory is not used for the purposes of aggression against Arab states defending their freedom and independence.

This would meet the vital national interests of West Germany and the interest of preserving general peace.

NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ITALY

August 1, 1958

The Soviet Government deems it necessary to make the following declaration to the Italian Government.

Since the military intervention by the United States and Britain in Lebanon and Jordan, the territory of the Italian Republic has become one of the bases used by the American command for the transfer of troops to these countries. The maritime ports of Italy (Naples, Taranto, Genoa) are being used by the US navy as bases for the preparation and implementation of the landing of American troops in Lebanon. At the airfield in Capodichino, near Naples, planes are continually arriving from West Germany with American troops, which are immediately sent on to the Middle East.

The Prime Minister of the Italian Republic, Sr. Amintore Fanfani, reported on July 19 in the Chamber of Deputies that the Italian Government gave its agreement to the use of two Italian airfields as transit points for American military transport planes delivering American troops and arms to the Arab world.

So far as it is possible to judge from these facts, the Italian Government, having by participation in NATO linked itself with partners who are trying militarily to force objectionable regimes on the Arab peoples, has in effect stepped on the path of aiding a military adventure that is creating a serious threat to peace.

Such a stand by the Italian Government is in obvious contradiction to its previous assurance as to the supposedly defensive nature of the NATO bases on Italian territory, and also, in particular, with the assurance in the message of January 17 from the Prime Minister of the Italian Republic, Sr. Adone Zoli, to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to the effect that "not only will Italy never perpetrate aggression, it will never join and never support such actions no matter by whom and no matter against whom".

And if American troops, based at Italian ports and airfields, are today using these bases as springboard of aggression,

the Italian Government, naturally, cannot deny what has now become obvious, that the assignment of Italian ports and airfields to foreign troops has nothing in common with the interests of preserving peace or with the interests of guaranteeing the security and defence of Italy.

The Soviet Government calls on the Government of the Italian Republic to take effective measures that the territory of Italy is not used for the purposes of aggression against Arab states defending their freedom and national independence. This would serve the vital national interests of Italy and the interests of the preservation of world peace.

NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

August 1, 1958

The Soviet Government deems it necessary to make the following declaration to the Government of Israel.

Since the first days of armed intervention by the United States and Great Britain against Lebanon and Jordan, American and British war planes have used extensively the air space of Israel for the transfer of British occupying forces to Jordan, for supplying them from bases located on Cyprus and at other points in the Middle East and Europe, and also for a "show of strength".

According to a statement by officials of Great Britain, the Government of Israel "has given its unqualified permission" to the flights by British and American war planes referred to, planes that have participated in the aggressive actions of the United States and Great Britain in the Middle East.

This stand by the Israeli Government makes Israel a direct accomplice in the aggressive actions of the United States and Britain against the peoples of Lebanon, Jordan and other Arab states.

The Soviet Government draws the attention of the Government of Israel to the true seriousness of the possible consequences of such a position on the part of Israel at a time when the threat to peace in the Middle East has grown. The

Soviet Government also considers it necessary to direct the attention of the Government of Israel to the fact that, having placed her air space at the disposal of Britain and the United States, Israel bears responsibility for the increase of tension in the Middle East, which could grow into a conflict with extraordinarily serious consequences for the national interests of Israel herself.

**FROM A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR, A. A. GROMYKO, AT THE SPECIAL EMERGENCY
SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE
WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN AND BRITISH TROOPS
FROM LEBANON AND JORDAN**

August 13, 1958

It became necessary to call this special emergency session of the General Assembly of the United Nations as a result of the armed intervention undertaken by the United States in Lebanon and by the United Kingdom in Jordan.

... Those who organised the intervention against Lebanon and Jordan are strenuously endeavouring to make their activities superficially acceptable. They have put forward all manner of pretexts, one more unfounded than the next, to justify these actions.

For instance, it has been asserted that the military occupation of Lebanon by the United States and of Jordan by the United Kingdom was needed to preserve the independence of these countries and to protect them against machinations on the part of the United Arab Republic. Reference has been made to domestic events in Iraq, as a consequence of which that country was proclaimed a republic and dissolved the federation with Jordan, which had been established as a result of imperialist intrigues in the Middle East directed against the independence of the Arab peoples.

An attempt was also made to justify the landing of the United States and United Kingdom forces on the ground that it was undertaken at the request of the President of Lebanon and the King of Jordan. And, of course, it has been said that soldiers, arms, tanks, warships and military

aircraft had to be dispatched to ensure the safety of the citizens of the United States and the United Kingdom, although it is well known that not a single American citizen in Lebanon and not a single British subject in Jordan received so much as a scratch or was even threatened. This is simply the argument which colonialists have used for many decades as a screen for their coercive activities against the peoples of the East.

What can we say about all these arguments which are being used to justify intervention in Lebanon and Jordan?

In as much as the military action taken by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Middle East constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and other generally recognised rules of international law, the arguments which are now being adduced *ex post facto* in defence of this action are absolutely unfounded and entirely contrary to the facts.

Indeed, although a great deal has been said about the alleged interference of the United Arab Republic in the affairs of Lebanon and Jordan, no one in Washington or London has been able to adduce any facts in regard to such interference. As is well known, the authoritative United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon, sent to that country in accordance with a Security Council resolution—for which, incidentally, the United States and the United Kingdom voted—has, in two reports based on an on-the-spot study of the situation, absolutely refuted the assertion that there has been any interference whatever by the United Arab Republic. As we know, Mr. Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who went to Lebanon, came to the same conclusion.

But the Government of the United States had disregarded the conclusions of United Nations representatives, because these conclusions do not suit those who prepared and carried out the intervention in the Middle East.

It has been said that events in Iraq were one of the reasons allegedly necessitating the dispatch of United States and United Kingdom forces to the Middle East. If specific proof were needed of the absurdity of such assertions, this has been provided by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom themselves. Literally a few days after the

United States representative had, at the meeting of the Security Council, expatiated on the "mob rule" in Iraq and after the domestic events in that country had been used as the main pretext for introducing foreign forces in Lebanon and Jordan, the United States and the United Kingdom announced their recognition of the Government of the Republic of Iraq.

...Thus, the United States and the United Kingdom are clearly acting in collusion in order to suppress the national liberation movement in the countries of the Middle East and, to an increasing extent, the United States is taking over the leadership of decrepit colonialism.

Those who direct United States and United Kingdom policy are bound together by their common interest in exploiting the peoples of the East and by their joint military and strategic plans against the socialist states and against countries recently liberated from colonial and semi-colonial dependence.

It is no secret that for many years after the Second World War, the United States and the United Kingdom have, in accordance with the general purposes of their policy, been attempting to convert the area of the Middle East which adjoins the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union into a military base. These efforts have been resolutely opposed by the peoples of the Arab countries, which have given, one after another, convincing proof of their unwillingness to serve as pawns in the military plans of the Western powers. Now that the last prop of foreign imperialism in that area, the Baghdad pact—whose very title today sounds like an anachronism—has begun to collapse, those who direct United States and United Kingdom foreign policy have plunged into dangerous military adventures. Soldiers, tanks, bombers and even atomic weapons, which the United States Secretary of Defence has publicly threatened to use against the Arab countries—these are the means with which they are attempting to "regularise" the situation in the Middle East to their own advantage. I need hardly point out how dangerous it is to play with fire in one of the most sensitive areas of the world and how grave a threat it creates to the maintenance of peace throughout the world.

In the circumstances, the states bordering on the Middle East must, of course, take the necessary steps to safeguard

their own security. As the Soviet Government has repeatedly and publicly stated, the USSR cannot be indifferent to the emergence of a serious source of military danger in the immediate vicinity of its frontiers.

Despite the reassuring statements frequently heard, the situation in the Middle East remains tense. Now, as before, there are still many hidden rocks on which the ship of peace may founder in this area.

...I should like to remind the Assembly of the proposals which the Soviet Government addressed to the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France as early as February 1957. As we know, the Government of the USSR proposed that an agreement should be reached whereby the governments of the great powers would assume certain obligations with regard to ensuring a lasting peace in the Middle East. The most important of these obligations are the settlement of controversial issues exclusively by peaceful means through negotiation, non-interference in the domestic affairs of the Middle Eastern countries, respect for the sovereignty and independence of those countries, and withdrawal of foreign troops from their territory.

Can anyone deny that, in the light of the events now occurring in the Middle East, these proposals have acquired even greater timeliness and importance?

...The question this emergency session of the General Assembly has been convened to consider is one of immense importance. Our organisation has now, perhaps, a greater opportunity than ever before of making a valuable contribution to the preservation of world peace.

On behalf of the Government of the USSR the Soviet delegation has submitted for consideration at the emergency session of the General Assembly the following draft resolution: On the Immediate Withdrawal of United States Troops from Lebanon and United Kingdom Troops from Jordan:

"The General Assembly,

"Recognising the necessity of adopting urgent measures for the relaxation of tension in the area of the Middle East in the interests of preserving universal peace,

"1. Recommends the Governments of the United States

of America and the United Kingdom to withdraw their troops from the territories of Lebanon and Jordan without delay;

"2. *Instructs* the Secretary-General to strengthen the United Nations observation group in Lebanon in accordance with the plan presented by the United Nations observation group in Lebanon in its second interim report, and to send an observation group to Jordan with a view to the supervision of the withdrawal of the United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan, and of the situation along the frontiers of those countries."

...It is well known that many of those taking part in this session of the General Assembly are engaged in a search for an appropriate formula in which to couch the demand for the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops. Of course if there is a real desire to facilitate the adoption of such a course, which is the only correct one, then it should not be difficult to find a formula. A suitable formula, it seems to us, is offered in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation.

**FROM A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR, A. A. GROMYKO, AT THE SPECIAL EMERGENCY
SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE
WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN AND BRITISH TROOPS
FROM LEBANON AND JORDAN**

August 20, 1958

What general conclusion suggests itself as a result of the debate that has taken place? The conclusion is, I think, obvious. A majority of the states represented in the United Nations condemn the invasion of the Middle East by United States and United Kingdom troops; it has created a tense situation in the area which for several years has been the object of almost ceaseless imperialist intrigues and acts of military provocation. If any further evidence was needed of the condemnation of the United States' and the United

Kingdom's actions towards these two Arab states, the debate at this session has provided cogent evidence of it.

...Rarely in the past has the United Nations witnessed anything comparable to what is happening now in the debate on the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from the Middle East.

No one but the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom themselves, and of several other states which are bound hand and foot by military and other obligations to those two powers, has defended the military intervention in Lebanon and Jordan. Particularly noticeable is the fact that the most zealous defenders of the occupation of those countries have been the delegations of states like Australia and New Zealand which are situated thousands of kilometres from the Arab world and therefore have but a very remote connection with the vital problems of that area, with the needs and concerns of its peoples.

...We recently listened to the statement which the President of the United States made in the United Nations. We were told that the United States by no means intended to confine itself to Lebanon and Jordan but intended to "reserve the right" to send its armed forces into other small countries as well. At whose discretion—that of the United Nations, perchance? Not at all, at the discretion of the United States. There is an example for you of respect for the United Nations, respect for its principles and purposes, respect for its Charter. If this sort of attitude towards the United Nations constitutes respect for its lofty principles and purposes, then I cannot imagine what disrespect for the United Nations or contempt and defiance of its principles would be.

...If, however, we are to consider who, in fact, are involved in indirect aggression and have made such aggression an integral part of their foreign policies, we must recognise that those who are guilty of it are the states which have also resorted to direct aggression against the countries of the Middle East. Many examples to prove this point could be found in the activities of both the United States and the United Kingdom. The statements made here by some delegations merely scratched the surface of what could be said on the subject.

If we were to confine ourselves merely to enumerating the plots uncovered time and again in one Arab country after another, organised from abroad for the purpose of overthrowing legal governments in the countries of the Arab world, if we were to confine ourselves to listing the statesmen of those countries who have been liquidated because they did not please those who wanted to control the destiny of the Arab peoples, that alone would suffice to demolish the myth that the introduction of United States and United Kingdom troops was dictated by the desire to protect Lebanon and Jordan from some "indirect aggression" from abroad.

We must also draw attention to another tactic which is resorted to by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom not only openly but also behind the scenes.

I have in mind the frequent and mysterious hints which have been dropped to the effect that the United Kingdom is allegedly prevented from carrying out an early withdrawal of its troops from Jordan by the threat of an attack on Jordan by Israel. It is being said outright that the United Kingdom would withdraw its troops from Jordan but cannot possibly do so because, supposedly, there is a danger that Israel would then attack Jordan and war would result. Can this attempt at intimidation by raising the spectre of a campaign by Israel against Jordan be interpreted otherwise than as part of a preconceived plan.

While all this is going on, the representatives of Israel are occupying their places among us, listening to all our statements and, of course, keeping themselves fully informed of what is going on behind the scenes. The Israeli delegation listens to all this, has so far remained enigmatically silent and neither refutes nor confirms what is attributed to Israel. In short, it is hedging in order to sell itself dear.

If we are to speak plainly about what may or may not happen in the event of British troops being withdrawn from Jordan, we must frankly state that unless Israel has the support of other countries, there can be no danger that it will attack Jordan. If, on the other hand, it is anticipated

that Israel will nevertheless do so, then obviously someone has laid plans along these lines in advance. If that is so let us openly admit that such plans exist. If there are no such plans, there is no need to arouse fear of Israel among Arabs. In that case the delegation of Israel should make a statement to that effect and put an end to speculation on the matter. If it does not, it will only strengthen our conviction that the General Assembly is witnessing a stage performance in which roles have been assigned in advance.

...Allow me to ask all those who have suddenly come to appreciate the great contribution of the Arabs to world history and culture: if you sincerely recognise this contribution and respect Arab nationalism why, then, are your troops occupying two Arab countries? Why are you unwilling to leave Lebanon and Jordan and why do you assume that the Arabs in Lebanon and Jordan cannot do without your tanks, guns, bombers and warships? Somehow your protestations that you respect nationalism do not accord with what you are actually doing in Lebanon and Jordan, and not in those countries alone.

Those who are defending the policy of the United Kingdom, in particular, have paid moving tribute from this rostrum to the great historic role of that country in relation to the peoples of the colonial countries. To hear them, one would imagine that the United Kingdom had for at least a hundred years been exclusively concerned with the liberation of the Asian and African peoples. Yet you all know very well that is far from true, that the stern facts of history are quite different.

...Our proposal for the immediate withdrawal of US and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan and for appropriate United Nations action has been countered by the proposal which, although known as Norwegian, is in reality a United States and United Kingdom draft resolution.

What is there to be said about this proposal? It is mainly intended to mislead the members of the Assembly and to create the impression that the United States and the United Kingdom also wish to withdraw their forces. One requires great experience in the analysis of casuistic texts to

determine whether this draft resolution has any connection whatsoever with the question of the withdrawal of foreign armies from Lebanon and Jordan. If we discard the casuistry and consider the true purport of this draft resolution, we find that its sponsors have simply left the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan suspended in midair. In effect, they propose that the Assembly should not express any views on the central question before this special emergency session and should completely rely on the goodwill and the fine promises of the United States and United Kingdom Governments.

In addition, the draft resolution is literally stuffed with proposals intended to divert the Assembly's attention from the essence of the question under review. There is reference to plans for the establishment of a United Nations police force, which the President of the United States light-heartedly described as a "peace force" in his statement to the Assembly in order to present this project in the most favourable light. There is clearly a psychological motive behind this. In the light of present events it is not difficult to understand what this US plan for the establishment of a so-called peace force holds in store for small countries. The experience of Lebanon and Jordan has shown that open armed intervention in the internal life of the Arab states has in our time become politically embarrassing, and a way is therefore being sought to cloak any future armed intervention in other forms, to engage in it under cover of the United Nations flag. As I see it, it is gratifying that the overwhelming majority of states have duly appreciated the danger inherent in such a plan and have left its authors in no doubt that they have seriously miscalculated if they expected to see it endorsed and adopted. . . .

If the Assembly wishes to justify the hopes of the peoples, if we all wish worthily to fulfil our duty to strengthen peace in the Middle East and remove the threat to peace which has arisen in that area, we must take steps to secure the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan.

NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

September 5, 1958

In connection with the note of the Israeli Government of August 12, 1958, the Soviet Government deems it necessary to make the following statement.

The Government of Israel in effect recognises its complicity in the Anglo-American aggression against the Arab countries, since, according to its own statement, it permitted British and American planes to use Israeli air space for the transit of British occupation forces and supplies to Jordan. Moreover, it is trying to justify its complicity in the Anglo-American military intervention in Jordan by the fact that the flights of British and American planes over Israel and the military occupation of Jordan were undertaken at the request of the Jordanian Government allegedly to defend Jordan from the threat of external attack.

Such an explanation of the complicity of Israel in the Anglo-American aggression against Lebanon and Jordan is utterly inconsistent. As is known, the references made by Britain and the United States to the appeal of King Hussein for military aid were exposed at the special emergency session of the UN General Assembly as a manoeuvre undertaken to mask their aggressive actions against the countries of the Arab world. It is also known that military intervention by Britain in Jordan was decisively condemned at the above-mentioned session of the UN General Assembly, which unanimously passed a resolution for the rapid withdrawal of US and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan.

The attempt by the Government of Israel to justify its complicity in the aggression against Arab countries by reference to the supposed weakness of the UN in guaranteeing observance of the Charter of this organisation is also baseless, for the principles of the UN Charter are being violated by those forces that are carrying out flagrant intervention into the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East and that have undertaken aggression against Lebanon and Jordan. Israel's complicity in this aggression hardly testifies to its concern for the observance of the principles of the

Charter, for it would then have supported not the aggressors, but those forces that defend the cause of peace and are struggling against the policy of doctrines directed to intervention in the internal affairs of other states.

In its note, the Israeli Government declares its aspiration for peace with neighbouring Arab countries, but the actions of the Israeli Government in relations with these countries directly contradict this declaration. If the Israeli Government really aspired to the establishment of peace with its neighbours, it would not have become an accomplice in the Anglo-American aggression against the Arab countries, nor even allowed the use of its air space by British and American planes for the transit of troops and arms to Jordan, and its officials would not have threatened to seize the western part of Jordan. The Soviet Government, as before, feels that the Government of Israel bears no small responsibility for the tension in the Middle East.

**From A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR, A. A. GROMYKO, IN CONNECTION
WITH THE GENERAL DEBATE AT THE 13th SESSION
OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

September 18, 1958

The Soviet delegation reserves the right to request, within the next few days, that the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom in Lebanon and Jordan and the delay in compliance with the General Assembly resolution concerning the withdrawal of their troops should be examined at this session as a separate item if the delay continues. . . .

Surely, the cold shower which those who engineered the aggression against Lebanon and Jordan received at the Assembly's special session should have sufficed. Yet today we see that it has not entirely deterred those who like to lord it in someone else's house. It is clear that, whatever the cost, they want to keep US guns and tanks in the Middle East in some guise or other, for example, in the guise of a "standby United Nations force" and this does not apply to the Middle East alone. Support for such plans would endanger the cause of peace and the United Nations itself.

The USSR delegation cannot pass over in silence the tragic events which have been taking place in Algeria for almost four years now. Unless we shut our eyes to evident facts we must recognise that in reality a war is being waged by a vast French army against the well-organised army of the Algerian National Liberation Front, which is fighting for its country's independence. It brings in its wake the loss of human life, the destruction of material wealth and untold suffering for the people of Algeria. We think it is high time to put an end to this war, so destructive for Algeria and unpopular even in France itself.

There is a good deal of talk these days about the holding of a referendum in Algeria on the new French constitution, the adoption of which will determine Algeria's destiny. But how can we talk of free expression of the Algerians' will in connection with this referendum, when there is in that country an army almost 800,000 strong which is suppressing by fire and sword the national liberation movement of the Algerian people struggling for their independence?

The Soviet delegation considers that at this juncture France would do great service to the cause of world peace by eliminating this dangerous hotbed of war in North Africa. The French Government has every opportunity to do this by entering into direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front in Algeria with a view to resolving the Algerian conflict by peaceful means. This is the only way the war in Algeria can really be ended.

Furthermore, how can one speak without indignation of what the United Kingdom is presuming to do to two small Arab states—Yemen, and Muscat and Oman? For several years now the population of these countries has been subjected to barbarous raids by British bombers and incursions by British forces. What right has the Government of the United Kingdom—which is a member of the United Nations and as such bound to respect our Charter—to resort to aggressive acts against these states? Can the United Nations ignore the crimes visited upon Yemen and upon Muscat and Oman? The Soviet delegation considers that the United Nations should have come to the defence of the peoples of these countries by condemning the aggression.

From THE SOVIET DRAFT DECLARATION ON GRANTING
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES
INTRODUCED FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE 15th SESSION
OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

September 23, 1960

We are all inhabitants of a single planet. We are born on it, work, raise children, hand on to them what we have accomplished in life. And though different states exist on the earth, all people are born equal in their dignity as citizens.

The whole course of historical development has now raised the question of the complete and final abolition of the colonial regime in all its forms and manifestations. And not sometime in the future, but immediately and unconditionally!

In accordance with this, the member states of the United Nations solemnly proclaim the following demands:

1. *Without delay, grant all colonial countries, trusteeships and other non-self-governing territories complete independence and freedom in the formation of their own national states in accordance with the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples. The colonial regime and colonial administration in all its forms must be abolished in full so as to give the peoples of these territories an opportunity to determine their fate and the forms of government.*

2. *In the same manner, abolish all colonialist strongholds in the guise of possessions and leased areas on foreign territories.*

3. *The governments of all countries are called upon to observe strictly and unshakably in relations between states the principles of the United Nations Charter and the present Declaration, principles of equality and respect for the sovereign rights and territorial integrity of all states without exception, not permitting any manifestations of colonialism, any exclusive rights or priorities for some states to the detriment of other states.*

...The sacred duty of every state and every government is to aid the rapid and complete implementation of the present Declaration.

From A NOTE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE USSR TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF THE UAR ON THE PROPOSAL BY THE USSR
DECLARING THE MEDITERRANEAN A NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

To the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the United Arab Republic

May 18, 1963

The matter at hand is the beginning of the implementation of plans for deploying US atomic submarines, armed with Polaris nuclear missiles, in the Mediterranean area.

...What will be the result of turning the Mediterranean into a gigantic reservoir stocked with dozens of rockets with megatons of nuclear pay-load? What is the meaning of turning the Mediterranean basin into a missile base *sui generis*, where every mile of the sea's surface can be used by an aggressor as a launching pad for firing nuclear missiles?

Above all, this immeasurably increases the threat that the Mediterranean and the countries around it may become the theatre of devastating military operations. Even states that do not have and do not want to have anything to do with NATO's aggressive preparations—such states are the overwhelming majority around the Mediterranean—in effect land in a position where the right to manage their future is appropriated by those who command atomic submarines cruising close to the shores of these states. The same dangerous policy that countries allowing the use of their territory for NATO military bases have been drawn into is now threatening their security and sovereignty.

...The introduction into the Mediterranean of NATO warships with nuclear weapons on board puts governments whose security is threatened by the North Atlantic bloc in need of effective counter-measures in order to be in a position to repulse any encroachment on the peaceful life of their peoples and not to give the NATO powers a free hand in the use of the Mediterranean as jumping-off grounds for possible aggression. Peace-loving states will have no choice but to keep the routes of atomic submarines within the sights of their means of retaliation—as they must do, too, with regard

to the coasts of NATO member countries and countries that have granted this bloc their territory for permanent or temporary bases for nuclear missiles.

...The Governments of the United States and other NATO countries are not sparing of assurances that US Polaris submarines are sent into the Mediterranean for allegedly "defensive purposes", in fact, for the "defence" of the countries of this area. However, it would be no exaggeration to say that, of all means created for waging war, the American weapons that are now being deployed in the Mediterranean are the least suitable for defensive purposes, and the most suitable for provocation. The distinctive characteristic of atomic submarines as mobile missile bases is that they are counted on for secrecy in preparation and suddenness of nuclear attack.

...It is not beside the point to note, further, that it has also been said many times of the US Sixth Fleet, roaming the Mediterranean for years now, that its mission is to aid the Mediterranean countries to protect their independence and security. But in the log of the commander of this fleet there is not a single entry to be found on operations in support of the sovereign rights and independence of the countries of North Africa or the Middle East. On the contrary, the ships of the Sixth Fleet participated in preparing an attack on Syria in 1957, an attack frustrated thanks to the decisive actions, above all, of the Soviet Union. This fleet was used by the United States, in the summer of 1958, to occupy the Lebanese coast. American warships covered the foreign intervention in Jordan. Within view of the Sixth Fleet, America's NATO allies—Britain and France—together with Israel attacked Egypt, bombing Cairo and Port Said.

...To promote international security, the Soviet Government proposes that the whole region of the Mediterranean be declared a zone free of nuclear weapons. It is ready to assume the obligation not to locate nuclear arms in the sea, having in view that analogous obligations will be undertaken by the other powers. If this region is declared a nuclear-free zone, then together with the United States and other countries of the West, the Soviet Union is ready to guarantee that the Mediterranean area, in the event of any military

complication, will be viewed as being outside the sphere of application of nuclear weapons.

The implementation of these proposals would further mutual understanding and friendship in the relations between the countries of the Mediterranean and would permit all the states of the Mediterranean basin to devote more effort and resources to the solution of their economic and social problems. It would be, at the same time, a major contribution to easing general international tension and ensuring peace in Europe, Africa and the whole world.

The Soviet Government is sure that it is possible to forestall the threat created by the location of Polaris submarines in the Mediterranean basin if all peoples and governments of the Mediterranean countries insistently demand the conversion of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, if they protest its use by foreign navies. The Soviet Government hopes that the Government of the UAR will for its part take measures that it deems possible and necessary in order to prevent the deployment of thermonuclear weapons in the Mediterranean basin.

**APPEAL OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS
OF THE USSR, A. N. KOSYGIN, TRANSMITTED
TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN,
HAROLD WILSON**

June 5, 1967

Reports have been received of military clashes between Israel and the UAR. The Soviet Government is convinced that it is the duty of all great powers to see to it that the military conflict is immediately halted. The Soviet Government has acted and will act in this direction. This is to express the hope that the Government of Great Britain will do everything possible for the cessation of the military conflict. The highest interests of peace demand this.

**APPEAL OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS
OF THE USSR, A. N. KOSYGIN, TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES, LYNDON B. JOHNSON**

June 6, 1967

The military action in the Middle East continues. Moreover, its scale is increasing.

The Soviet Government is convinced that a resolute demand for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of troops behind the armistice line would correspond to the interests of restoring peace. We express the hope that the Government of the United States will support this demand in the Security Council. We are supporting it.

Everything possible must be done so that the Security Council today passes a positive resolution on this question.¹

STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

Today, June 5, 1967, Israel began military operations against the United Arab Republic, thus performing an act of aggression. The armed forces of the UAR are fighting against the Israeli forces that have invaded the territory of the UAR.

Tanks, artillery and aircraft are engaged in military action on both sides.

The Syrian Arab Republic has joined the side of the UAR and is giving armed assistance in repulsing aggression. Jordan has declared that it is in a state of war with Israel and that it will give military aid to the United Arab Republic. Iraq, Algeria and other Arab states have also declared their support of the UAR with armed forces and other resources.

Thus, because of the adventurism of the rulers of one country, Israel, encouraged by the secret and open activity of certain imperialist circles, a military conflict has flared up in the Middle East.

¹ Analogous appeals were sent on June 6, 1967, to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Harold Wilson, and the President of France, Charles de Gaulle.

Leaders who constantly declare that they are, allegedly, waging a struggle for the existence of Israel as a state have pushed that country to this dangerous act. But if anything is capable of undermining the basis of the development and the very existence of the Israeli state, it is just this politically reckless course that the leading circles of Israel have today chosen. The Government of Israel, having attacked neighbouring Arab states, has trampled on the United Nations Charter and the elementary norms of international law.

The Government of Israel cannot say that it did not know what it was doing. It dare not say that the position of the peace-loving states in the event of Israel's unleashing an aggressive war was not clear.

The Government of Israel knew that it was possible to avoid war. The Soviet Union and other peace-loving states called for this. But the Israeli Government chose the path of war. There is no doubt that the adventure undertaken by Israel will, first of all, turn against her.

The Soviet Union, true to its policy of aiding peoples who are victims of aggression and states that have freed themselves from colonial oppression, declares its determined support of the governments and peoples of the United Arab Republic, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, Jordan and other Arab states and expresses confidence in the success of their just struggle for their independence and sovereign rights.

Condemning aggression on the part of Israel, the Government of the USSR demands of the Israeli Government, as a first and urgent measure for the liquidation of the military conflict, immediately and unconditionally to cease military operations against the United Arab Republic, Syria, Jordan and other Arab countries, and withdraw its troops behind the armistice line.

The Government of the Soviet Union expresses the hope that the governments of other states, including the great powers, will for their part do everything to extinguish the fires of war in the Middle East and restore peace.

The United Nations must do its direct duty—condemn the actions of Israel and immediately take the necessary measures to restore peace in the Middle East.

The Soviet Government reserves for itself the right to take all necessary measures stemming from the situation.

**APPEAL OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF
MINISTERS OF THE USSR, A. N. KOSYGIN, TO THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES, LYNDON B. JOHNSON**

June 8, 1967

Two days have passed since the Security Council resolution on the cessation of military operations in the Middle East.

The facts show that Israel, after the appeal by the Security Council, has seized significant territories from the Arab states—the United Arab Republic and Jordan—ignoring the Security Council resolution. A situation has developed that demands, in connection with these Israeli actions, not just a cease-fire, but the withdrawal of Israeli troops behind the armistice line. The Arab states are put in a position by the actions of Israel that they cannot but wage a legitimate defensive war against the aggressor, who has thrown out a challenge to the Security Council and all peace-loving states. Under these circumstances, the restoration of peace in the Middle East cannot be ensured until the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territory of the Arab states.

We have instructed the Soviet representative in the UN to raise this question in the Security Council so that the latter can adopt a suitable resolution.

We would like to express the hope, Mr. President, that you personally and your Government will take a position corresponding to the interests of ending the war in the Middle East, and the interests of peace, as you have already stated.¹

**STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL**

June 7, 1967

There are reports from diverse sources that the resolution of the UN Security Council on an immediate cessation of shooting and of all military operations is not being implement-

¹ An analogous appeal was sent on June 8, 1967, to the President of France, Charles de Gaulle.

ed by the Israeli side. Israel is flagrantly and demonstratively flouting this resolution and continues the war against the Arab states.

Such a position on the part of the Government of Israel shows once again the aggressive nature of your policy, which does not take into account elementary norms of international relations and shows open disrespect for the principles and goals of the United Nations Charter.

The Soviet Government has sternly warned the Government of Israel against carrying out a policy of aggression and adventure. However, Israeli leaders have not heeded the voice of reason.

If the Israeli Government does not now immediately fulfil the common demand of the states, expressed in the Security Council resolution on an immediate cease-fire, the Soviet Union will review its attitude to Israel and make a decision touching on the further maintenance of diplomatic relations with Israel, which by her actions opposes herself to all peace-loving states. It is a matter of course that the Soviet Union will consider and implement other necessary measures stemming from the aggressive policy of Israel.

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLENUM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE CPSU ON THE POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION
IN CONNECTION WITH THE AGGRESSION BY ISRAEL
IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

June 21, 1967

Having heard and discussed the report of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "On the Policy of the Soviet Union in Connection with the Aggression by Israel in the Middle East", the plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU has resolved:

to approve fully the political line and practical activity of the Politbureau of the Central Committee, activity directed to ending the aggression by Israel, to supporting the UAR, Syria and other Arab states subjected to attack, to forestalling the dangerous consequences of the aggression for the cause of world peace,

The aggression by Israel is a result of a conspiracy of the most reactionary forces of international imperialism, above all of the United States, directed against one of the contingents of the national liberation movement, against the leading Arab states, which have entered the path of progressive socioeconomic transformations in the interests of the labouring people and which are carrying out an anti-imperialist policy.

In a situation in which the United States continues its war of rapine in Vietnam, the aggression by Israel in the Middle East is one more link in the general chain of the policy of bellicose imperialist circles, which are trying to stop the historic progress of national independence, democracy, peace and socialism.

The Soviet Union, other socialist countries and all progressive, anti-imperialist forces are on the side of the Arab peoples in their just struggle against imperialism and neocolonialism, for the inalienable right to decide for themselves all the questions of their internal life and foreign policy. The plenum of the Central Committee, expressing the will of Soviet Communists, of the whole Soviet people, resolutely condemns Israel's aggression and declares its solidarity with the peoples of the UAR, Syria, Algeria and other Arab countries.

The plenum notes that rapid, determined and joint action by the Soviet Union and other socialist states played an important role in the cessation of military operations in the Middle East. This stand by our Party and the Soviet Government and their practical measures in connection with events in the Middle East received the full support of the whole Soviet people.

The plenum of the Central Committee notes with satisfaction that at a crucial moment in the course of international events, the fraternal socialist states acted together, shoulder to shoulder, signing the Declaration of June 9, 1967. It was confirmed yet again that joint action by the socialist states is a powerful factor in the struggle against the aggressive intrigues of international imperialism.

The plenum of the Central Committee fully approves the Declaration of the Central Committees of Communist and Workers' Parties and of the governments of socialist countries of June 9 of this year and affirms that the Soviet Union, to-

gether with other socialist countries, will do everything possible to aid the peoples of the Arab countries decisively to repulse the aggressor, to safeguard their legitimate rights, to put out the flames of war in the Middle East and to restore peace in this area.

At the present moment, when the forces of imperialism and neocolonialism, using the situation created by Israel's aggression in the Middle East, infringe on the independence and territorial integrity of the Arab countries, the most important task is to prevent the aggressor from using the results of his treacherous actions, to obtain immediately, without any conditions, the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from territories occupied by them behind the armistice line and compensation for the damages inflicted by the aggressor on the UAR, Syria and Jordan.

In accordance with the fundamental goals of the policy of our Party, as defined by the 23rd Congress of the CPSU and reaffirmed at the plenum of the Central Committee in December 1966, it is necessary in the future, too, to wage a struggle against the bellicose forces of imperialism and their policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, to continue the line of supporting the Arab states in their struggle for freedom, independence, territorial integrity and social progress.

It is also necessary in the future to strengthen the friendship and solidarity between the Soviet Union and the Arab states, to vigorously rebuff the intrigues of imperialism, to expose its true, anti-national aspect, to wage a fight against the slanderous campaign and splitting activities of the Mao Tse-tung group, activities that are meant to break up the anti-imperialist forces and undermine trust between the peoples of the Arab states and the peoples of the socialist countries.

The plenum of the Central Committee considers that events in the Middle East underline with renewed force the need for unity of action among the Communist and Workers' Parties, the international workers' movement and the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, among all peace-loving and progressive forces, all to whom freedom and independence of peoples and struggle for general peace, are dear.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, putting the decisions of the 23rd Congress into life, will in the future unswervingly wage a fight against the aggressive forces of imperialism, encourage great vigilance by the Soviet people, consistently implement the Leninist course of peaceful co-existence of states with different social structures, fulfil its internationalist duty to support in all ways peoples struggling for their freedom and national independence and for social progress. The joint actions of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, of the national liberation movement, are capable of curbing the aggressor and preventing a new world war.

The plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU calls Party organisations and all working people of the Soviet Union to renewed efforts directed towards the building of communism, towards the further strengthening of the economic and military might of the country, to meet in a worthy manner the glorious 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

**From THE DECLARATION BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEES
OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES
AND THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF BULGARIA, THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC,
THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, THE POLISH
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST
REPUBLICS, THE CZECHOSLOVAK SOCIALIST REPUBLIC
AND THE SOCIALIST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA**

June 9, 1967

On June 9 of this year the leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties and of the governments of the socialist countries met in Moscow.

...The gathering reviewed the situation that has developed in the Middle East following Israel's aggression, which is a result of a conspiracy of certain imperialist circles, above all in the United States. The participants of the meeting exchanged views concerning measures that are necessary to end aggression and prevent its dangerous consequences affecting the cause of general peace.

The participants of the meeting consider it necessary to draw suitable conclusions from the fact that Israel has not submitted to the resolution of the Security Council and has not halted military operations against the Arab states. The occupation by Israeli troops of the territory of Arab states would be used for the restoration of a foreign colonial regime.

As of June 9, Israeli troops, despite the fact that the Government of Syria has announced a cease-fire, are staging a new offensive along the Syrian border, subjecting the towns of Syria to barbarous bombing.

Struggling against imperialism for their freedom and independence, for the integrity of their territories, for their inalienable sovereign right independently to decide all questions of their internal life and foreign policy, the peoples of the Arab countries are defending a just cause. The peoples of the socialist countries are completely on their side.

The peoples of the UAR and a number of other Arab states have in the last few years attained historic victories in winning national independence and freedom. Important social transformations have been carried out in the interests of the labouring masses.

We express confidence that these gains will be preserved and the progressive regimes strengthened, despite the difficulties met by the Arab peoples along the way.

At a difficult hour for the states of the Arab world, the socialist countries declare their full and complete solidarity with the just struggle of the Arab states and declare that they will aid the Arabs in repelling aggression and defending their national independence and territorial integrity.

The states participating in this meeting demand that Israel immediately cease military operations against neighbouring Arab countries and withdraw all her troops from their territory behind the armistice line.

It is the duty of the United Nations to condemn the aggressor. If the Security Council fails to take the appropriate measures, the onerous responsibility for this will be borne by the states that have not fulfilled their duty as members of the Security Council.

Today as never before, joint action by all peace-loving and progressive forces, by all to whom the freedom and independence of peoples are dear, is necessary.

If the Government of Israel does not halt its aggression and does not withdraw its troops behind the armistice line, the socialist states that have signed this Declaration will do everything necessary to help the peoples of the Arab countries decisively to repel the aggressor, to protect their legitimate rights, to put out the seat of war in the Middle East and restore peace in this area.

The just struggle of the Arab peoples will triumph.

**From A SPEECH BY THE CHAIRMAN
OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS
OF THE USSR, A. N. KOSYGIN, AT THE SPECIAL EMERGENCY
SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

June 19, 1967

Typically, after the start of hostilities, when in the first hours of the armed clash the Soviet Union strongly condemned the Israeli aggressors and demanded universal condemnation of their perfidious acts as, well as an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops behind the armistice line, the very same forces, which can only be termed accomplices in aggression, did all they could to help Israel gain time, carry out new conquests and attain her designs. As a result, the Security Council found itself unable to take the decision which was dictated by the existing emergency. This is why responsibility for the dangerous situation in the Middle East rests not only with Israel, but also with those who stand behind her in these events.

At the present time extremist belligerent circles in Tel Aviv claim that their seizure of Arab territory provides them—as they arrogantly assert—with grounds to present new demands to the Arab countries and peoples. An unbridled anti-Arab propaganda campaign, played up by the press of certain Western countries, is being conducted in Israel; the force of arms is extolled; threats against the neighbouring countries are voiced; and it is being stated that Israel will heed no decisions, including those of the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, unless they satisfy Israel's demands.

The aggressor is flushed with triumph. The long-matured plans to recarve the map of the Middle East are now being put forward. Israeli leaders proclaim that Israel will not leave the Gaza strip of the west bank of the River Jordan. They declare that Israel intends to maintain her control over the whole of Jerusalem, and assert that if the Arab countries did not want to comply with Israeli demands, the Israeli forces will simply remain in their present positions.

What is the attitude of the United States and British Governments towards the claims of Israel? Actually, they are promoting the aggressor here as well. How else can the aggressor interpret their position in the Security Council, which blocked the adoption of the proposal for an immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops behind the armistice line? The words in support of political independence and territorial integrity of the Middle Eastern countries coming lavishly from the representatives of the United States could have meaning only if those who utter them would unequivocally reject the territorial claims of the aggressors and come out in favour of an immediate withdrawal of their troops.

...Guided by the lofty principles of the United Nations Charter and the desire to eliminate the consequences of aggression and restore justice as quickly as possible, the Soviet Government submits the following draft resolution to the General Assembly:

"The General Assembly,

"*Noting* that Israel, in gross violation of the United Nations Charter and the universally accepted principles of international law, has committed a premeditated and previously prepared aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, and has occupied parts of their territory and inflicted great material damage upon them,

"*Noting* that, in contravention of the resolutions of the Security Council of June 6, 7 and 9, 1967 on the immediate cessation of all hostilities and a cease-fire, Israel continued to conduct offensive military operations against the above-mentioned states and seized additional territory,

"*Noting* further that although military operations have now ceased, Israel continues her occupation of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, thus failing

to halt her aggression and defying the United Nations and all peace-loving states,

"Regarding as unacceptable and unlawful Israel's territorial claims on the Arab states which prevent the restoration of peace in the area,

"1. *Vigorously condemns* Israel's aggressive activities and the continuing occupation by Israel of part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, which constitutes an act of recognised aggression;

"2. *Demands* that Israel should immediately and unconditionally withdraw all her forces from the territory of those states to positions behind the armistice demarcation lines, as stipulated in the general armistice agreements, and should respect the status of the demilitarised zones, as prescribed in the armistice agreements;

"3. *Demands* also that Israel should make good in full and within the shortest possible period of time all the damage caused by her aggression on the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, and on their nationals, and should return to them all captured property and other material assets;

"4. *Appeals* to the Security Council to take for its part immediate effective measures in order to eliminate all consequences of the aggression committed by Israel."

The Government of the Soviet Union expresses the hope that the General Assembly will take an effective decision ensuring the inviolability of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab states, and the restoration and consolidation of peace and security in the Middle East.

**From A SPEECH BY L. I. BREZHNEV AT A RECEPTION
IN THE KREMLIN IN HONOUR OF THE GRADUATES
OF MILITARY ACADEMIES**

... The Middle East is one of the major areas of the national liberation movement. The leading Arab states—the UAR, Syria and Algeria—have chosen a non-capitalist path of development. The progressive Arab states adhere in their foreign policy to an anti-imperialist course.

International imperialism, above all American and British imperialism, does not wish to reconcile itself to this. For

many decades, imperialists have viewed this region as their own fief, they have been accustomed to decide on their own arbitrament the fates of the peoples living there.

... The main reason for Israel's aggression against the Arab countries is the aspiration of American and British imperialists to inflict a blow on the national liberation movement in the Middle East, to stop the movement of peoples along the path of social progress at any cost, to turn countries that have won freedom and independence at so dear a price again to slavery, to take the riches from them. The efforts of imperialist propaganda to depict this aggression as the supposed result simply of national differences between Israel and the Arab countries are intended to hide its true reasons, to mask the class essence of the events. The essence of the Middle East crisis consists in the antagonism between the forces of imperialism and the forces of national independence, democracy and social progress.

The Soviet Union sees its duty to be to frustrate the plans of the imperialists in the Middle East, aiding the Arab states to defend their freedom and independence. We long ago established relations of genuine friendship and co-operation with many Arab countries, as with other countries that have liberated themselves from colonial oppression and are developing along the path of progress.

In the first days of Israel's aggression, the Soviet Union, in close co-operation with other socialist states and in constant contact with the Arab countries, undertook energetic measures to stay the hand of the aggressors, to defend the legitimate interests of the Arab peoples, to halt the military conflict, to prevent it from growing to proportions dangerous for all mankind. Today, looking back, it is possible to say with certainty that in the critical days of the Middle East crisis our actions were correct.

Now, when military operations have ceased, it is necessary above all that the troops of the aggressor withdraw from all territories that they have seized. The aggressor cannot be permitted to extract benefits from his treacherous attack, aggression cannot go unpunished.

The situation in the Middle East remains tense, and it is necessary to do everything so that the flames of war do not again flare up. The Israeli Government, enjoying the

support of its protectors, the United States, Britain and West Germany, is hurling an insolent challenge to peace-loving states. The actions of the high-handed rulers of Israel in the occupied territories of the Arab countries deserve the most resolute condemnation.

The aggressors are acting as the most shameless brigands. In their atrocities with respect to the peaceful Arab population, they obviously strive to emulate the villainies of the Nazi invaders.

...We would like to stress once more that the aggressors must clear off foreign lands and recompense the peoples of the UAR, Jordan and Syria for the losses inflicted on them. Justice demands this. The Soviet people and honourable people the world over demand this.

The Soviet Union firmly and resolutely supports the Arab states in their struggle for freedom and territorial integrity and renders them aid of all kinds. A few days ago, as you know, the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, N. V. Podgorny, was in Cairo, Damascus and Baghdad on friendly official visits. We attribute great significance to these visits, to the frank and friendly exchange of views that took place with President Nasser, President Atassi and President Aref and also with other leading figures of the Arab countries.

The exchange of views will undoubtedly aid the further strengthening of our relations and the co-ordination of joint actions in the political struggle for the defence of the rights and interests of the UAR, Syria and other Arab countries.

Stirring up conflict in the Middle East, the imperialists directed the main blow against countries that have entered on the non-capitalist path of development, trying in the first place to overthrow progressive regimes. But imperialism did not achieve its goal.

From this rostrum we would like to say to our Arab friends: Soviet people well understand that you are now going through a difficult time. But in the liberation struggle—and the history of every people testifies to this—there are not only victories, but also temporary setbacks. These setbacks cannot break a people who have stepped firmly on the path of freedom and independence, they only strengthen their determination in the struggle.

Events in the Middle East have shown once more how perfidious the imperialists are and how important it is to defend skilfully the gains made in the course of the national liberation struggle. National and social liberation is a just cause, and for its sake it is necessary to strengthen in every way the states that have freed themselves, their defence capacity, their unity; it is necessary always to be ready to repulse the aggressive intrigues of imperialism.

We express our firm conviction that the just cause of the Arab peoples, who have risen in a fight for national independence and social progress, will triumph. We are confident that the revolutionary forces of the Arab world will draw the necessary conclusions from the recent events. In their struggle against aggression, the Arab peoples are strengthening their unity.

The imperialists have now set their propaganda machine going at full speed, they pour out floods of lies and slander, trying to weaken and isolate the Arab countries, to pit them against one another, to drive a wedge between the Arab countries and the Soviet Union and other socialist states. Most of all, the imperialists would like to undermine the friendship of the Arab peoples with our Soviet country.

Our Arab friends well understand the meaning of this poisonous propaganda. They understand that in the situation that has arisen it is especially important to strengthen the united front of the Arab peoples and the peoples of the socialist countries.

In discussion with Soviet representatives, the leaders of friendly Arab states, Nasser, Atassi, Zouein, Boumedienne, Aref and others stress that the peoples of these countries appreciate the support that the Soviet state has given and is giving them, that the Arabs will firmly guard the friendship with the Soviet Union from all encroachments.

The friendship and union with the progressive forces of the national liberation movement is the unshakeable line of Soviet foreign policy, a line set down by Lenin. We will in the future consistently and firmly put this line in life.

From A STATEMENT BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

July 23, 1967

On July 21 of this year, the special emergency session of the UN General Assembly, called to examine the question of overcoming the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab states, broke off its work. By a resolution of the Assembly, all its findings were handed over to the Security Council, in order to aid the review by the Council of the tense situation in the Middle East as a question of extreme importance. The President of the General Assembly was instructed to reconvene the Assembly whenever this becomes necessary.

...The question arises: Who prevented the General Assembly from fulfilling its duty in accordance with purposes proclaimed by the UN Charter, which strictly forbids aggressive actions? There can be only one answer: the General Assembly could not make an effective decision on eliminating the consequences of Israeli aggression and on the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the conquered territories because of the position of the United States, some of its allies, and also of those states that bowed to the pressure of the United States and its blackmail applied at the decisive moment with flagrant lack of tact.

The Soviet Government expresses the firm conviction that all peace-loving states must continue their efforts to force the aggressor to withdraw his troops from occupied Arab territories. So long as the aggressor's troops are stationed on Arab territories, so long as Israel, with reckless impudence, advances territorial and other claims on neighbouring Arab countries, there will be no peace in the Middle East. Military provocations that Israel is organising in the Suez Canal Zone testify to the fact that a renewal of the war can be expected any day.

A great and responsible task now confronts the Security Council, to whom the General Assembly has handed over the findings of its special emergency session. In the further examination of the question of overcoming the consequences of Israeli aggression, the Security Council must fully take into account the desire, clearly expressed at the session by

a majority of states, to achieve a constructive solution to this problem and above all—the withdrawal of Israel's troops from the Arab lands conquered by them. For its part, the Soviet Government, as before, is ready to co-operate with all peace-loving states for this purpose.

The Soviet Government also affirms that the Soviet Union, together with other socialist states, will in the future support the Arab states politically in their just struggle for their lawful rights, will aid them in restoring and developing their economies, in strengthening their defence capacity.

And if those states that have, because of their positions up to this time, hindered the resolution of the problem of the abolition of the consequences of Israeli aggression, do not review their line, they will take on themselves a grave responsibility before all peoples of the world.

TASS STATEMENT

August 30, 1969

The Soviet public learned with anger that in the Arab sector of Jerusalem, occupied by the armed forces of Israel, the Al-Aksa mosque was set on fire. The mosque, one of the most ancient and unique monuments of Arab architecture in the Middle East, is a place of pilgrimage for many believers and is revered as one of the Moslem holy places.

This crime has provoked a wave of just anger and rage in the countries of the Middle East, Asia and Africa.

The Israeli Government and the imperialist circles that support Israeli aggression cannot but bear responsibility for this act of vandalism. Moreover, the invaders continue provocative acts against peaceful inhabitants. In response to peaceful demonstrations of protest by the Arab population in Jerusalem, Nablus and other occupied towns, Israeli authorities sent troops for reprisals.

Relying on the support of imperialist and Zionist circles in the West, the present Israeli leaders do not wish to reckon with world public opinion, they trample on the UN Charter and the principles of international law and strive to undermine the settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The latest events in the Arab sector of Jerusalem, events connected with the arson at the Al-Aksa mosque and the planned destruction by the Israelis of whole blocks populated by the Arabs, again confirm the need for immediate measures by all peace-loving countries and peoples in order to overcome the consequences of imperialist aggression by Israel and, above all, the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories occupied in June 1967.

The Soviet people share the just indignation of the Arab peoples in connection with the barbarous actions of the Israelis on the occupied Arab territories and appeal to all people of goodwill, interested in the preservation of peace, to call for the immediate political settlement in the Middle East, for the establishment of a just and firm peace in accordance with the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, in the interests of the countries and peoples of this region.

From A SPEECH BY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR, A. A. GROMYKO, AT THE PLENARY MEETING OF THE 24th SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

September 19, 1969

It is impossible to qualify in any other way than as a direct challenge to the United Nations and to all peoples, the obstruction by Israel of any measures for a political settlement in the Middle East. What are they waiting for, what are they counting on, those Israeli leaders who are bent on annexing the territories of the Arab states seized two years ago, constantly organising new military provocations against those states and acting contrary to the well-known Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, which has been recognised by all states, except Israel, as a realistic basis for a settlement?...

Everything indicates that the wish of the leaders in Tel Aviv is to bring about in the Middle East not peace but further complications. Consequently a situation is developing which is pregnant with new explosions. The danger of such a development is clear to all.

A political settlement in the Middle East that is fair to all the states in that area must be attained in the interests of all countries and peoples. The Soviet Union, together with many other states, is strongly in favour of such a settlement. It has also pursued this line on an international scale in recent months to give effect to the Security Council resolution, including the consultations between representatives of the four powers which are permanent members of the Council. We have submitted corresponding specific proposals for consideration by the participants in the exchange of views.

On the United States side the question has been mooted—by way of stabilising the situation—of limiting the supply of arms to the Middle East. As the Soviet Government has already stated to the United States Government, a discussion of that question cannot serve any useful purpose so long as Israeli troops are occupying the territories of Arab countries.

TASS STATEMENT

October 26, 1969

The US Embassy in Lebanon has recently distributed a statement which, under the pretext of concern for guaranteeing "the independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon", in effect sets forth claims by the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of the Lebanese Republic. It says that the interests of the United States in these areas stand above the interests of any other state taken individually.

The goals that the United States is pursuing are evident from the statement itself. It is reminiscent of the ancient colonial practice in which the major powers, citing the violation of their interests in some area of the world, intervened in the internal affairs of states or peoples in order to deprive the people of their inalienable right to decide their own affairs themselves.

No intervention from without by a major power in events transpiring in Lebanon can be approved. The Lebanese Republic is an Arab country, closely connected with other Arab

states, and no one can decide questions arising around Lebanon better than the Arab states themselves. They know their interests and their goals better. It is understandable why public opinion in the Arab countries, including Lebanon, received the statement by the United States with indignation, justly considering it an attempt to force on Lebanon a sort of American tutelage.

Events around Lebanon are undoubtedly a consequence of the growing tension in the Middle East, provoked by Israeli aggression, the consequences of which have not been overcome to this day. Israel is not implementing the UN resolutions, continues her adventuristic policy of provocations against Arab states, while some Western powers, above all the United States, connive at this Israeli policy. Not the least place in these plans is assigned to undermining the unity of action of the Arab states, using the forces of internal reaction in the Arab countries, inciting them to clashes with the national and patriotic forces. In the Middle East, in particular around Lebanon, a chain of intrigue seems to be woven again, attempts are being made to direct blows to wrong ends.

If the United States, as it affirms in its statement, were really interested in the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of the Arab states, it should first of all direct its efforts towards securing the promptest implementation of the United Nations resolutions on the Middle East settlement, resolutions that call for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories and for the just resolution of the problem of the Palestinian refugees, and other outstanding problems.

Events transpiring in Lebanon provoke concern among Soviet people. The firm opinion is being expressed in leading Soviet circles that no foreign power should infringe on the sovereignty of Lebanon and on its right to determine its own internal affairs, nor interfere in questions that are within the competence of the Arab states themselves. Confidence is also expressed that the leaders of the Arab countries can find ways to forestall a worsening of the internal situation in Lebanon and prevent anyone from sowing dissension among the Arab peoples and setting the Arab states against each other.

STATEMENT ON THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

by the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and the Government of the Polish People's Republic, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic

November 27, 1969

Tension has dangerously grown again in the Middle East as a result of the aggressive policy of the most bellicose imperialist circles.

Israel is organising military provocations against the United Arab Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan and other Arab states on an ever growing scale. Large armed forces are involved in these provocations: heavy artillery, aircraft and tanks are being used. In the occupied Arab territories, Israel is conducting a policy of colonial plunder, oppression and coercion with respect to the Arab population. These actions by Israel are extremely dangerous, they push events in this area towards a new military conflict. This provocative policy by Israel puts obstacles in the way of establishing a just and firm peace in the Middle East and is an expression of the plans directed against the progressive regimes in Arab countries, against the national independence of all Arab states, against the liberation movement of the Arab peoples, a movement that plays an outstanding role in the struggle against imperialism. The imperialists are trying to restore the positions they have lost in the Middle East in order to continue to plunder the national wealth of the Arab countries, in the first place their oil resources. It is just for this reason that

imperialist circles of some Western powers, above all in the United States, actively encourage the Israeli policy of annexation in the Middle East and give ever increasing financial, military and other aid to Israel. The latest weaponry, including aircraft and missiles, is handed over to the aggressors in significant quantities.

Two years have elapsed since the Security Council passed a resolution obligating Israel to withdraw its troops from the occupied Arab territories, a resolution aimed at establishing a just peace in the Middle East. Up till now, however, this resolution has not been implemented because of the provocative, adventuristic position of Israel, which stubbornly ignores the will of the United Nations.

Israel and her patrons deliberately undermine a political settlement, calculating that they will succeed in annexing the conquered Arab lands. Only thus can Israel's attitude towards the insistent demands of world public opinion, to the resolutions of the UN Security Council, including its resolution of November 22, 1967, be evaluated. After the recent parliamentary elections in Israel, conducted in conditions of intoxicating chauvinism, the deliberately reactionary, extremist forces, that push the Israeli people to deepening its conflict with its Arab neighbours, strengthened their position.

Obstructing the political settlement of the Middle East conflict, the Israeli ruling circles are drawing the Israeli people farther and farther into a criminal, drawn-out struggle with the Arab peoples. This policy creates serious danger in the first instance to the Israeli people itself, and it holds a threat to world peace. This aggressive course of Israel and those circles in the West that inspire and encourage Israeli aggression meets with growing indignation the world over.

The peoples of the world demand that, finally, decisive measures be taken to implement the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. The non-implementation of this resolution means the encouragement of the aggressor and will discredit the United Nations and lead to a further dangerous aggravation of the situation in the Middle East.

The present serious situation in the Middle East demands that urgent measures be taken. The peoples of the world must force Israel to withdraw her troops from the conquered Arab territories. Without the settlement of this question there

can be no firm and just peace in the area. Together with other questions, the question of guaranteeing the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab people of Palestine, who are waging a courageous national liberation, anti-imperialist struggle, must also be fairly resolved.

Life shows that the imperialists continue their attempts to overthrow progressive regimes in the Arab countries, using the ruling Zionist circles of Israel as their weapon. The enemies of the Arab peoples build their calculations on a weakening of the unity of the Arab states. Therefore, the strengthening of the solidarity of the Arab states has special significance in the struggle for the elimination of the consequences of Israel's aggression.

The socialist countries, the sincere friends of the Arab states, express their fraternal solidarity with the peoples of the Arab countries who are waging a struggle in defence of their national independence, sovereignty and freedom.

Our parties, peoples and governments are firmly resolved to do all within their power to wreck the plans of the aggressors in the Middle East. The socialist countries will continue to give aid to Arab states, which are waging a struggle for the preservation of the progressive achievements of their peoples against infringement by Israel and her patrons.

In the name of our parties, peoples and states, we call on all peoples, all peace-loving states, to give effective support to the Arab peoples in their just struggle for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories, in the struggle for freedom and independence, against the intrigues of imperialist forces in the Middle East, for the just resolution of the Middle East crisis, for establishment of a firm peace in this area, and promoting world peace.

**MR. AHMED HASSAN AL-BAKR, PRESIDENT
AND PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ**

Baghdad

Dear Mr. President,

In the name of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, of the Soviet Government, of the people of our country and from ourselves personally, we heartily congratu-

late you and the entire friendly Iraqi people on the signing of an agreement on the peaceful settlement of the Kurdish problem, an agreement that will put an end to the drawn-out civil war in Iraq.

We are convinced that the implementation of this important agreement will further the national unity and friendship of the two fraternal peoples of the Republic of Iraq, Arabs and Kurds, will further the successful realisation of social and economic transformations in the country in the interests of the whole Iraqi people and of raising its standard of living and well-being.

The peaceful settlement of the Kurdish problem in Iraq raises the international prestige of the Republic of Iraq and of its government, which is an important contribution to the cause of consolidating the unity of the Arab countries in their common struggle against the forces of imperialism, for the abolition of the consequences of Israeli aggression.

Allow us to express our sincere desire for peace and prosperity for the friendly Iraqi people.

N. Podgorny *A. Kosygin*
Moscow, the Kremlin, March 17, 1970

**From A SPEECH BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PRESIDUM
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR, N. V. PODGORNYY,
AT A RECEPTION IN THE KREMLIN IN HONOUR
OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UAR, GAMAL ABDEL NASSER**

June 31, 1970

The growing friendship of the peoples of the USSR and UAR, the friendship of the socialist and Arab countries, frightens the enemies of peace and social progress. They make persistent efforts to undermine this friendship. However, no one will succeed in weakening, much less annulling, what has taken shape and gained strength in the course of many years of joint struggle against the forces of reaction and imperialism.

The peoples of the Soviet Union follow with great attention and sympathy the progressive development of the United

Arab Republic, which is carrying out social and economic reforms for the benefit of its people. There is no doubt that the people of the UAR will reach the goals that stand before it, no matter what intrigues and provocations imperialists and international Zionist circles resort to.

Naturally, there are and, perhaps, will in future be, difficulties in this great and complex task.

But the difficulties can be overcome, the attacks of the imperialists and their henchmen beaten off, if the proper path of development is chosen, if vigilance is maintained with regard to enemies, if in struggle and in work trust is placed in sincere and reliable friends, if the government and people act as one. We ardently wish the people of UAR and its leaders new and great successes on the chosen path.

**From A STATEMENT OF THE SUPREME SOVIET
OF THE USSR ON THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

July 15, 1970

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expresses serious concern and alarm in connection with the threat to world peace created in the Middle East by the aggressive actions of Israel and her imperialist patrons.

Israel's present policy consists in blocking the path to a political settlement in the Middle East, increasing pressure on Arab countries and consolidating the fruits of her aggression. But these calculations are groundless. Any plans that would allow Israel to continue her occupation of Arab territories, much less annex them, that would set the interests of Israel above the interests of the other states of this region, are doomed to failure.

The peoples of the Arab world have not known peace for decades, they have had to wage an intense struggle for national liberation and social progress, the whole area has often been subjected to military shocks. The reason for this has been the policy of imperialism, which has tried to inflict a blow to the liberation movement of the Arab peoples and preserve its own strategic and economic position in this region, in particular the opportunity to exploit its oil resources. The imperialist powers, above all the United States, and the

tool of their policy in this area, the ruling circles of Israel, bear the full responsibility for the dangerous situation in the Middle East. The United States in practice encourages the Israeli ruling circles.

The problem now stands thus: either a further growth of the military danger in the Middle East—and this can happen if the aggressor is not curbed—or the taking of measures that would secure a political settlement on the basis of the full implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

The deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR are convinced that in a situation where the reckless actions of the Israeli ruling circles create a real threat to international peace and security, no parliament and no member of a parliament can stand on the sidelines. Determined measures by all to whom the ideals of peace, freedom and the independence of peoples are dear and who seek the denunciation and isolation of the aggressor and his patrons, are needed to force the aggressors to renounce the continuation of their adventuristic course.

**From A STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE USSR**

September 9, 1970

Officials in the United States have recently been spreading all sorts of fabrications to the effect that the situation in the Middle East is being aggravated because of the position of the Soviet Union, that the Soviet Union is somehow "violating undertaken obligations" in connection with the cease-fire in the Suez Canal Zone.

At the obvious inspiration of official circles, the American press has started a campaign of slander against the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that this is a premeditated campaign to distort the policy of the Soviet Union and simultaneously to whitewash the Israeli ruling circles, who bear direct responsibility for the present aggravation of the situation in the Middle East, for the violation of the cease-fire agreement, for the difficulties with which the mission of the special UN envoy, Gunnar Jarring, has met. Attempts are being made to

delude world opinion, to shift responsibility for the situation in the Middle East to the Soviet Union and the Arab countries. However, these attempts are unfounded and are fundamentally at variance with the facts.

...One cannot help noting that the United States is itself taking actions that lead to an aggravation of the situation in the Middle East. This is evident, for example, in the transfer of additional US warships to the Mediterranean, a "show of force" by the US Sixth Fleet, the provocative nature of which was underlined by the personal participation of the President of the United States.

It is just in this period that the US Government conducted a series of negotiations with Tel Aviv, decided to give Israel more Phantom jets, and granted Israel new credits for the purchase of weapons and military equipment in the United States.

It is relevant to remark, too, that the United States is trying to appropriate the "right" to carry out reconnaissance flights over the territory of the UAR. It was the Soviet Union that officially stated to the Government of the United States that such actions further complicate the situation in the area and are a crude violation of the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic.

American statesmen have said a lot lately about the trust that is necessary in international relations. Do they think that their actions in the Middle East, the attempts to mislead world opinion by the unscrupulous distortion of facts promotes confidence in the policy of the United States in the Middle East?

In a situation where the UAR and Jordan have confirmed their readiness to negotiate through Gunnar Jarring and when the cease-fire is in effect being maintained, it depends on Israel and the external forces that support her whether or not this favourable opportunity is used to achieve a political settlement in the Middle East. The United States must choose what end its policy will serve in the Middle East: will it continue to encourage Israel's reckless aspirations or will it actually step on the path of implementing the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, on the path of aiding the establishment of a just and firm peace in this region?

The Soviet Union has been and remains a firm adherent

of a political settlement of the problems of the Middle East on the basis of the implementation in all points of the above-mentioned Security Council resolution.

The Soviet Government will continue in the future to further this goal within the framework of bilateral meetings and in consultations of the four powers that are permanent members of the Security Council.

From A STATEMENT BY TASS

September 20, 1970

In the capital of Jordan, Amman, and in a number of other places in the country fierce battles are being fought between government troops and armed Palestinian groups; artillery and tanks are engaged. There are numerous killed and wounded, among them civilians.

The fratricidal conflict in Jordan threatens the fundamental interests of Jordan, of the Palestinian resistance movement, the interests of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples and can benefit the enemies of the Arab peoples, especially in conditions of continuing Israeli aggression.

In this connection, reports of the movement in the eastern Mediterranean of the US Sixth Fleet, which, as is known, has been used more than once as a weapon against the national liberation movement in the Arab world, cannot but cause concern. Other reports are coming in that certain circles in some countries are nurturing plans for military intervention in Jordan.

Such a turn of events would still further aggravate the situation in the Middle East and would not only create a danger for the independence of Jordan and other Arab countries, but would also significantly complicate the international situation as a whole.

The situation in and around Jordan is met with deep concern in the Soviet Union and among all friends of the freedom and independence of the Arab peoples.

Hope is being expressed in official Soviet circles that the peoples of the Arab countries, their leaders and governments and Arab organisations will do everything to attain a prompt

cessation of the fratricidal war in Jordan, to forestall a dangerous turn of events in the Middle East.

It is felt in the Soviet Union that external armed intervention in the Jordanian events would deepen the conflict, and would make more difficult the struggle of the Arab countries for the abolition of the consequences of Israeli aggression, the achievement of a firm and just peace in the Middle East, the restoration of the rights and national interests of the Arabs that have been trampled on. All those to whom the cause of peace is dear, who favour the strengthening of international security, cannot reconcile themselves to this.

The Arab countries and peoples can be sure that the Soviet Union, as before, will follow a policy of support for their just struggle for the consolidation of complete independence and their national development, for the preservation and strengthening of general peace.

APROPOS EVENTS IN JORDAN

September 24, 1970

In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR

In connection with the armed clashes in Jordan between units of the Jordanian army and Palestinian detachments, the Embassy of the USSR in Amman and also the Soviet embassies in Damascus and Baghdad have, on the instructions of the Soviet Government, established contact with leading statesmen in Jordan, and, correspondingly, in Syria and Iraq. On the Soviet side the firm conviction was expressed that everything must be done for the prompt cessation of the fratricide that has flared up in Jordan, a struggle that can only play into the hands of forces not concerned with the establishment of a firm peace in the Middle East.

On all questions connected with events in Jordan, permanent contact is being maintained with President Nasser of the United Arab Republic.

In view of the increasing concentration of the units of the US Sixth Fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean, and of other military preparations by the United States in this area, the

Soviet Government, through the Soviet Embassy in Washington, has called the attention of the United States Government to the need for all states to show circumspection in their actions in connection with the complex situation that has taken shape in the Middle East, and to the fact that any external intervention in the events taking place in Jordan would complicate the situation in the Middle East, and the international situation as a whole, still more. It was stressed, too, that the Government of the United States could use its weight to prevent Israel from using the Jordanian events for her own aggressive purposes.

The Government of Great Britain was informed of the Soviet point of view on the events taking place through the Soviet Embassy in London. The hope was expressed that, for its part, Great Britain would not permit intervention into the internal affairs of the countries of this region.

Contact was established with the French Government through diplomatic channels with a view to exchanging opinions and information on the events taking place and on steps being taken by the Soviet and French sides.

The Soviet representative at the United Nations is maintaining corresponding contact with the UN Secretary-General and with the missions of a number of member states of the Security Council.

The necessary steps will be taken in the future, too, to help end the conflict in Jordan and to forestall the intervention of external forces.

**FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FIRM PEACE
AND SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST
STATEMENT OF THE POLITICAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE MEMBER STATES
OF THE WARSAW TREATY ORGANISATION**

December 2, 1970

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, represented at a conference of the Political Con-

sultative Committee of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation in Berlin, reviewed the situation in the Middle East and, in this connection, drew up the following statement.

A situation dangerous for the cause of peace continues in the Middle East. For more than three years, Israeli troops have occupied Arab territories. Imperialist policy, carried out by the ruling circles of Israel and by the external forces of international reaction, is piling ever new obstacles on the way to implementing a political settlement in the Middle East. One must not underestimate the profundity and scale of the dangers connected with this, considering the international significance of this region.

There are two opposite courses in the Middle East problem. One course is a consistent effort to achieve by political means a settlement that would guarantee every people in the Middle East, including the people of Israel, an independent, secure national existence that would make their borders secure, and allow them to turn their efforts, resources and energy to satisfy their pressing requirements. But there can be no peace in the Middle East so long as Israeli troops do not withdraw from all occupied Arab territories. Without this, it is impossible to imagine that the people of the Middle East can live as good neighbours. Advocates of this course—the UAR and other Arab states and the socialist and other peace-loving states that support them—call for the implementation of all points of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, which is the basis for the restoration of peace in the Middle East. As first practical steps, they insist on the establishment of contact and negotiations between the conflicting sides through the mediation of the special representative of the UN Secretary-General, Dr. Gunnar Jarring.

The other course is set towards the retention by any means and the annexation of the captured territories of the Arab states, towards the maintenance of tension in the Middle East, the overthrow of progressive Arab regimes and the undermining of the Arab national liberation movement. Israel and her patrons persistently sabotage everything that leads to a just settlement. They try to dictate their imperialist demands to the peoples of this region, declaring in effect that either these demands will be accepted or there will be no peace. Not long

ago, this policy was condemned yet again at the 25th session of the UN General Assembly.

The full responsibility for the fact that the area of the Middle East continues to be one of the most dangerous seats of tension in the world, rests with the forces of international, and above all American, imperialism. The militarist ruling circles of Israel, flaunting their predatory plans and programmes for the formation of a "Greater Israel", in fact jeopardise the vital interests of the Israeli people.

The conference expresses confidence that the attempts of imperialist countries to estrange and set the Arab peoples against one another will in the future, too, be resisted by the efforts of the Arab states and peoples to strengthen their unity and solidarity. The participants of the conference are convinced that, as in the past, the intrigues of international reaction against progressive Arab regimes are doomed to failure. In this respect, they express deep satisfaction with the statements of the leaders of the United Arab Republic that they intend to pursue unswervingly the course that the UAR followed during the life of President Gamal Abdel Nasser, that they are for a political settlement of the Middle East conflict, against international imperialism, for independence, freedom and progress, for friendship with the socialist countries, for peace and international concord.

The participants of the conference affirm their readiness in the future resolutely to support the just struggle of the Arab peoples, including the Arab people of Palestine, against the imperialist policy of aggression in the Middle East, for the liberation of the occupied Arab territories, for freedom and social progress.

STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

February 28, 1971

The overcoming of the consequences of Israeli aggression and the achievement of a political settlement of the Middle East conflict continue to be among the most important and urgent international problems, on which depends the international situation. New efforts have been made recently to achieve a political settlement in the Middle East. However,

the situation has again become more complicated, and the matter of a political settlement may have been thrown backwards. The ruling circles of Israel are clearly working for this.

On February 21 of this year, the Israeli Government published an official statement to the effect that it refuses to withdraw Israeli troops from the occupied territories of Arab states, in particular from the territory of the United Arab Republic, and that Israel "will not withdraw to the armistice lines of June 4, 1967".

Israeli extremists have never hidden their predatory plans and efforts to annex the Arab territories occupied in 1967. However, the circumstances in which the Israeli Government issued this statement give it special meaning and significance.

Recent weeks have offered greater opportunities than ever before for reaching an agreement on political settlement on the basis of the implementation by all parties concerned of all the provisions of the well-known Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. The consistent efforts of the United Arab Republic for the resolution of the Middle East problem by political means played a decisive role in this.

As a result of the efforts of the UAR and a number of other Arab countries, efforts supported by an enormous majority of the states of the world, a month and a half ago the special representative of the UN Secretary-General, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, renewed contacts with the parties involved in the conflict. From the very beginning, these contacts—for the first time—took on the character of a discussion of concrete measures that form a part of the measures necessary for a political settlement. Wishing to create a favourable atmosphere for the success of the negotiations, the Arab countries, despite the fact that part of their territory remained for the fourth year under Israeli occupation, agreed to continue observing the cease-fire. The Government of the UAR proposed the renewal of international shipping on the Suez Canal if Israeli troops began to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula.

All this promoted the establishment of contacts. On February 8, the special envoy of the UN Secretary-General, noting an opportunity for progress in the political settlement, asked both sides to inform him of their readiness to undertake

specific obligations relative to the two key problems of the settlement—the withdrawal of troops from the occupied territories and the conditions on which peace could be established in the Middle East.

The position of the United Arab Republic on this question is clear and positive. As indicated in statements by UAR representatives, and, in particular, in connection with the appeal of the special envoy of the UN Secretary-General, the United Arab Republic is prepared to sign a peace agreement with Israel if Israel commits herself to withdraw her troops from all occupied territories and implement the UN resolutions on the Palestinian refugees. The UAR is willing that the peace agreement should stipulate the obligations of the parties for ending the state of war, respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of each other, for recognition and respect of the right of each of the parties to live in peace within secure and recognised borders, for non-intervention in each other's internal affairs. The UAR agrees, within the framework of a political settlement, to guarantee freedom of shipping on the Suez Canal in accordance with the Constantinople Convention of 1888 and freedom of shipping in the Tiran straight in accordance with the principles of international law. Finally, the UAR has accepted the idea of creating demilitarised zones on both sides of the border and of deployment in some areas of UN armed forces to maintain peace.

The constructive position of the UAR Government was received with great satisfaction by all who are sincerely striving for peace in the Middle East. Even those circles that are far from sympathising with the national liberation struggle of the Arabs, with the United Arab Republic and other Arab states that have stepped on the path of progressive development, could not but admit that the position of the UAR, as a whole and in detail, corresponds to the programme for a political settlement drawn up by the Security Council. The bold, realistic position of the UAR has further increased its international prestige. It has conclusively exposed the slander by the enemies of the Arab national liberation movement that the UAR is not prepared to accept conditions for peace in the Middle East that are just for all, including Israel.

It is obvious that the negotiations have reached the decisive stage. It would be enough for the Government of Israel to declare its readiness to undertake its share of the obligations for a political settlement, including the obligation to withdraw troops from all occupied territories, and, at last, a genuine turn to peace in the Middle East would have been made.

However, this has not happened. In her declaration of February 21, Israel in effect responded negatively to the main point of the appeal of the special envoy of the UN Secretary-General; without a resolution of this problem—that of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories—there can be no peace in the Middle East. In so doing, Israel came out openly as an aggressor, she showed the whole world once more that she does not wish to renounce her predatory ways and will not stop short of challenging the United Nations and the whole world.

What the Government of Israel is counting on in its efforts to undermine a political settlement, to further aggravate the situation in the Middle East, is a secret to no one. She counts on support from the United States, which constantly encourages Israel's policy of aggression against the Arab countries, provides the Israeli aggressors with broad patronage and supplies them with the latest types of arms.

Representatives of the United States have many times spoken of the American Government's wish to achieve a political settlement in the Middle East. But words and deeds are widely divergent in US policy. Verbally, the United States is for peace in the Middle East, for a settlement of the Middle East conflict by political means. In deed, Israel has been and remains the strike force of US imperialism that serves to undermine a political settlement and create dangerous new complications in the Middle East. In words, the Government of the United States recognises the legitimate interests of the Arab states. In practice, it supports the aggressive policy of Israel.

For this reason, the United States shares with Israel full responsibility for the situation that is taking shape in the Middle East. It shares responsibility, too, for the latest obstructionist step by Israel—her stated refusal to withdraw

her troops from the Arab territories—and for all its possible consequences.

The question remains: what is the direction of further events in the Middle East? Every government, every responsible politician must recognise that, in the Middle East, the alternatives are the following: a political settlement or a military conflict. Therefore the Soviet Government feels that vigorous action by all states interested in peace to prevent Israel and her patrons from undermining the cause of a political settlement is especially necessary now. If the peace-loving states unite their efforts in the struggle for such a settlement in the Middle East, then this object can be attained.

If, however, the ruling circles in Israel count on attaining, through a policy of sabotage, their principal goal for which aggression was launched against the Arab countries in 1967—to crush the Arab national liberation movement, and topple the progressive regimes established in the UAR and other Arab countries—they should remember that such calculations are doomed to fail. The Soviet Union, a friend of Arab peoples, is providing the necessary political and material aid in their struggle for the liberation of lands seized by the Israeli aggressors. This aid will be provided, too, in the future.

The Soviet Government stands determinedly for the settlement of the Middle East conflict by political means. It will continue to do everything to ensure that, in the struggle between the forces of peace and the forces of aggression in the Middle East, the policy of peace wins a victory.

**From THE REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE CPSU TO THE 24th CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST
PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION**

March 30, 1971

The Middle East is another "hot spot" in world politics. The crisis which has arisen as a result of Israel's attack on the UAR, Syria and Jordan has been one of the most intense in the development of international relations over the past period.

Together with the fraternal socialist countries we did everything necessary to stop and condemn the aggression. We raised this question in the UN Security Council in the most resolute terms. An extraordinary session of the General Assembly was called on our demand. The USSR and other fraternal countries have broken off diplomatic relations with Israel, which has ignored the UN decision for a cease-fire. Our country has helped to restore the defence potential of the Arab states which were subjected to invasion, the UAR and Syria in the first place, with whom our co-operation has been growing stronger from year to year.

The United Arab Republic recently came out with important initiatives. It announced its acceptance of the proposal put forward by the UN special representative, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, and readiness to conclude a peace agreement with Israel once the Israeli troops are withdrawn from the occupied Arab territories. The UAR has also proposed steps to resume navigation along the Suez Canal in the very near future. Thus, the attitude of the Arab side provides a real basis for settling the crisis in the Middle East. The Israeli Government's rejection of all these proposals, and Tel Aviv's now openly brazen claims to Arab lands clearly show who is blocking the way to peace in the Middle East, and who is to blame for the dangerous hotbed of war being maintained in that area. At the same time, the unseemly role of those who are instigating the Israeli extremists, the role of US imperialism and of international Zionism as an instrument of the aggressive imperialist circles, is becoming ever more obvious.

However, Tel Aviv ought to take a sober view of things. Do Israel's ruling circles really expect to secure for themselves the lands of others they have occupied and to go scot free? In the final count, the advantages obtained by the invaders as a result of their piratical attack are illusory. They will disappear as mirages pass from view in the sands of Sinai. And the longer they delay in reaching a political settlement in the Middle East, the stronger will be the indignation of world public opinion, and the Arab people's hatred of the aggressor and its patrons, and the greater the harm the Israeli rulers will inflict on their people and their country.

The Soviet Union will continue its firm support of its Arab friends. Our country is prepared to join other powers, who are permanent members of the Security Council, in providing international guarantees for a political settlement in the Middle East.

Once this is reached, we feel there could be a consideration of further steps designed for a military détente in the whole area, in particular, for converting the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and friendly co-operation.

STATEMENT BY THE 24TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

For a Just and Lasting Peace in the Middle East

We who represent 14 million Soviet Communists, expressing the will of the peoples of the Soviet Union, strongly condemn Israel's imperialist aggression against the Arab states conducted with US imperialist support and declare our fraternal solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Arab peoples for the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression, for the triumph of the ideals of freedom, independence and social justice.

The persistent refusal of the Israeli rulers to withdraw their troops from captured Arab territories is an open challenge to world public opinion and the decisions of the United Nations.

Therefore, it is the duty of all peace-loving forces to concert efforts in curbing the Israeli aggressors, force them to respect the universally accepted standards of international life and the legitimate rights of the Arab states, and to withdraw their troops from captured Arab territories.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU expresses its firm conviction that the attempts of the imperialists and their henchmen to impose their dictate on the peoples of the Arab countries, to subvert the progressive regimes in the Middle East and to defeat the national liberation movement in that part of the world, are doomed to failure. The legitimate rights and interests of all Arab peoples, including the Arabs

of Palestine, will triumph. The Israeli aggressors will be compelled to get out of the Arab territories seized by them in 1967. The guarantee of this is the unbending will of the Arab peoples, their striving for independence, freedom, peace and social progress, their close alliance with the peoples of the Soviet Union and those of the other socialist countries, with all anti-imperialist, peace-loving forces.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU declares that, consistently pursuing the Leninist policy of international peace and friendship, the Soviet Union will continue to support the just cause of the Arab peoples who suffered from Israeli aggression, to support their efforts at regaining their violated rights, to secure a fair political settlement in the Middle East, and to protect the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

We call on all fraternal Parties, on all peace-loving peoples and states to redouble their solidarity with the peoples of the Arab countries and to render them active support in their struggle.

From A RESOLUTION OF THE 24TH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION ON THE REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

April 9, 1971

The Congress, in approving the policy of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government in the Middle East, instructs them to continue to pursue the line of utmost support for the Arab peoples subjected to aggression by Israel, which is being encouraged by US imperialism, a line of developing close co-operation with the progressive Arab states. The Soviet Union will seek a just political settlement in the area, which implies withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories, exercise by each state of its right to an independent existence, and also satisfying the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

TREATY

of Friendship and Co-operation Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Arab Republic

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Arab Republic,

firmly convinced that the further development of friendship and all-round co-operation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Arab Republic corresponds to the interests of the peoples of both states and serves the cause of strengthening general peace,

inspired by the ideals of struggle against imperialism and colonialism, and for freedom, independence and the social progress of peoples,

full of determination unswervingly to wage a struggle for the strengthening of international peace and security, in accordance with the unshakeable course of their peace-loving foreign policy,

affirming their loyalty to the goals and principles of the United Nations Charter,

motivated by the desire to strengthen and solidify the traditional relations of sincere friendship between both states and peoples by concluding a Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation, having created thereby a basis for their further development,

have agreed to the following:

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that between both countries and their peoples there will always exist an unbreakable friendship. They will in the future develop and strengthen the relations of friendship existing between them and the all-round co-operation in political, economic, scientific, technological, cultural and other areas on the basis of the principles of respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-intervention in the internal affairs of one another, equality and mutual benefit.

Article 2

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as a socialist state, and the United Arab Republic, which has set as its goal a socialist reconstruction of society, will closely and thoroughly co-operate in securing conditions for the maintenance and further development of the socio-economic achievements of their peoples.

Article 3

Guided by the desire to aid in every way the maintenance of international peace and the security of peoples, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Arab Republic will continue with full determination to work for the achievement and securing of a firm and just peace in the Middle East in accordance with the goals and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Conducting a peace-loving foreign policy, the High Contracting Parties will work for peace, the easing of international tension, the achievement of general and complete disarmament and the banning of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

Article 4

Guided by the ideals of freedom and equality of all peoples, the High Contracting Parties condemn imperialism and colonialism in all their forms and manifestations. They will continue in the future to denounce imperialism and call for the complete and final liquidation of colonialism through the implementation of the UN Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and they will wage an unwavering struggle against racialism and apartheid.

Article 5

The High Contracting Parties will continue to expand and deepen their all-round co-operation and exchange of experience in economic, scientific and technological spheres—in

industry, agriculture, water use, irrigation, development of natural resources, construction of power projects, training of specialists and in other areas of the economy.

The Parties will expand trade and shipping between the two states on the basis of mutual benefit and the most-favoured-nation principle.

Article 6

The High Contracting Parties will aid the further development of co-operation between them in the fields of science, art, literature, education, public health, press, radio, television, cinematography, tourism, sport, and other areas.

The Parties will help expand co-operation and direct contacts between political and public organisations of working people, between enterprises and cultural and scientific institutions with a view to deeper mutual acquaintance with the life, labour and achievements of the peoples of the two countries.

Article 7

Being deeply interested in safeguarding peace and the security of peoples and attaching great significance to the co-ordination of their actions in the international arena in the struggle for peace, the High Contracting Parties will, for this purpose, regularly consult each other at various levels on all important problems affecting the interests of both states.

In case a situation develops that creates, in the opinion of both sides, a threat to peace or the violation of peace, they will without delay contact each other to co-ordinate their positions in order to remove the threat that has arisen or to restore peace.

Article 8

To strengthen the defence capacity of the United Arab Republic, the High Contracting Parties will continue to develop their co-operation in the military sphere on the basis

of existing agreements between them. This co-operation will provide, in particular, for aid in training the military personnel of the UAR, in the mastery of arms and equipment delivered to the United Arab Republic to strengthen its capacity in the matter of overcoming the consequences of aggression as well as to strengthen its capacity to resist aggression in general.

Article 9

Proceeding from the goals and principles of the present treaty, each of the High Contracting Parties declares that it will not enter alliances and will not take part in any groupings of states, or in actions or measures, directed against the other High Contracting Party.

Article 10

Each of the High Contracting Parties declares that its obligations under existing international treaties do not contradict the provisions of the present treaty and pledges itself not to enter into any international agreements incompatible with them.

Article 11

The present treaty is operative for 15 years from the day it comes into force.

If neither of the High Contracting Parties declares, one year before the expiration of the time indicated, its wish to discontinue the treaty, it will remain in force for another 5 years, and so on, until one of the High Contracting Parties makes a written declaration one year before the expiration of the current five-year period of its intention to discontinue the treaty.

Article 12

The present treaty is subject to ratification and will come into force on the day instruments of ratification are exchan-

ged, which will take place in Moscow in the very near future.

The present treaty is drawn up in two copies, each in Russian and Arabic, both texts being equally authentic.

Done in Cairo, May 27, 1971, which corresponds to the 3rd day of rabia ath-thani 1391 year of Hijra.

*For the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics*
N. PODGORNÝ

*For the United Arab
Republic*
ANWAR SADAT

**TO THE GENERAL NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE ARAB
SOCIALIST UNION OF THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC**

July 25, 1971

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sends its greetings to the participants of the General National Congress of the Arab Socialist Union of the UAR and wishes you success in your work.

Your congress opens on the day of the 19th anniversary of the glorious July Revolution of 1952, carried out under the leadership of the great son of the Egyptian people, Gamal Abdel Nasser. This revolution overthrew the rule of the hirelings of foreign imperialism and reaction and led the people of Egypt onto the path of true national independence. In the years after the revolution, the UAR began to play an outstanding role in the Arab national liberation movement, giving an example of independent national development along the path of progress, notwithstanding the intrigues of imperialist and reactionary forces.

The love of freedom and the steadfastness of the Egyptian people, its achievements in the development of the economy, in raising the cultural level and political consciousness of the masses, allowed it to withstand Israel's imperialist aggression and, relying on the support of friendly, peace-loving forces, to preserve its revolutionary achievements and progressive, anti-imperialist regime. The Arab Socialist Union, created by President Nasser, played an important role in this.

The work of your congress is taking place in the difficult conditions of continuing Israeli aggression, encouraged by the imperialism of the United States. The imperialists and their accomplices want to impose their rule, to perpetuate the occupation of Arab lands seized as a result of the June aggression of 1967, to hinder the development of the anti-imperialist revolution in the Arab countries. They resort to all the manoeuvres possible and sometimes disguise themselves in peaceful and sympathetic clothing. In reality, the imperialists have unalterably been and remain the most vicious enemies of the national interests and aspirations of the Arab and all other peoples.

The activity of the Arab Socialist Union, directed to undermining imperialist intrigues, to mobilising the working masses for the strengthening of the progressive regime in the UAR, to the liberation of the territory temporarily occupied by the aggressor and to solving the tasks of socio-economic and cultural development, meets with the understanding and support of Soviet Communists, of the whole Soviet people.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has a great deal of sympathy for the revolutionary experience of the UAR. The working people of Egypt and their political organisation, the Arab Socialist Union, by their patriotic struggle and selfless labour, are making an important contribution to the world anti-imperialist movement for freedom and independence of peoples, for peace, social progress and for socialism.

The Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, which came into force on July 1, 1971, strengthens the solidarity of our peoples in their joint anti-imperialist struggle. It is an important link strengthening the solidarity of the Arab national liberation movement with the Soviet Union, with all anti-imperialist forces, and it helps raise a barrier to the expansionism and subversive activity of imperialist and Zionist circles.

The policy of the Soviet Union and the UAR of settling the Middle East conflict in accordance with the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, meets with the ever-growing support of the peoples of the world.

Guided by the decisions of the 24th Congress of the CPSU, the Soviet Union will continue in the future to carry out the

line of expanding the all-round and fruitful Soviet-Egyptian co-operation, of lending support to the people of the UAR in its just struggle against aggression and in the construction of a new, free society.

We wish the friendly Arab Socialist Union, the whole Egyptian people, success in the defence of their national independence, in their struggle for the restoration of the territorial integrity of their country, for solidarity and unity of the national forces struggling for the socialist future of Egypt.

May the world-wide anti-imperialist front grow stronger!

Long live the friendship and co-operation between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Arab Socialist Union, between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic!

*Central Committee of the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union*

**From A SPEECH BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL
OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR, A. N. KOSYGIN,
IN THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA**

October 6, 1971

For the relations between governments to be not only normal, but distinguished by close co-operation and mutual trust, a definite community of interests is also necessary, and, obviously, we have every ground to say that we have such a community. It is revealed in the identity of interests of the Soviet Union and Algeria in the anti-imperialist struggle, in the struggle for national and social liberation, for international security, for the inalienable right of every people to be master of its own fate. This is what cements the friendship of our peoples, our co-operation, and opens a broad scope to their further development.

It seems to me that all this, along with the desire of both sides to combine their economic potential in the interests of the peoples of both countries, ensures favourable conditions for our friendly relations and co-operation in various fields.

...Throughout the world, all friends of the Arabs greet warmly their every step leading to the solidarity of the Arab

countries in the struggle against imperialism, and, in the present circumstances, above all against Israeli aggression as a manifestation of imperialist policy in the Middle East. And on the contrary, disagreements between the Arab countries, which weaken their ability to overcome the consequences of aggression and restore the legal rights and interests of the Arab peoples, including the Arab people of Palestine, provoke deep regret. The solidarity of the Arab countries in the struggle against Israeli aggression will strengthen, too, the international solidarity of all the progressive forces in the world with the Arabs.

The enemies of the Arab peoples fear most of all their unity, their friendship and their co-operation with the Soviet Union and other socialist states. The imperialists and their agents in Israel are doing everything to divide the Arab countries and their peoples, to undermine their friendship and co-operation with the socialist countries. And if they succeed in attaining this goal even temporarily on any sector, they count it a great victory. Anti-communism is stirred up through their efforts, which always weakened the movement for independence, democracy and social progress.

Acting on the principle that their imperialist aims justify the dirtiest means, the enemies of Soviet-Arab friendship try in every way to provoke in the Arab countries distrust of Soviet foreign policy, they spread fables about some sort of "Soviet expansionism". Obviously, they calculate that their colonial past has nourished a deep distrust among the Arabs for those states that at one time ruled in this area. Our enemies are now trying to extend this distrust to the Soviet Union, too, slanderously attributing completely alien goals to its foreign policy in the Middle East. The foreign policy of the Soviet state, as of any other state, is a continuation of its internal politics. The class essence and goals of foreign and domestic policies cannot contradict each other. Is it really possible for the multinational Soviet Union, the country of the Great October Socialist Revolution, where the nationalities problem was solved for the first time, where not only the political and legal equality of nations was guaranteed, but also real equality through a more rapid development of the economy and culture of the previously backward peoples—is it really possible that such

a country could follow an opposite policy in its relations with other countries? No, in no way. That would mean the worst betrayal of our political principles, of the precepts of our great teacher and leader, Lenin. The founder of our party and state taught the Soviet people to respect all peoples, to value their trust highly, and especially the trust of those peoples who have suffered national oppression and to whom it is necessary *"to prove* that we are *not* imperialists, that we will *not* tolerate any *deviation* in this direction.

"This is a question of world import, without any exaggeration of the word. In this question we must be especially strict," stressed Lenin.

In these words, the deepest feeling of the internationalism of our leader is expressed.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is unwaveringly true to the Leninist principles, it will firmly pursue them in the future, too, because a political party that is the avant-garde of the working class and of all workers, which expresses their interests, which is the intelligence, honour and conscience of its class—such a party cannot allow itself to retreat in its foreign policy from those basic principles by which it is guided in its domestic policy.

Not only we, but our enemies, too, know this well. It is just for this reason that they viciously slander the Soviet Union and our Communist Party, they slander because they want to hinder the liberation of peoples from national and social oppression, for which the progressive forces of all mankind are struggling. The Arab peoples have learned to distinguish their friends from their enemies. They can see through the machinations of those who would restrain progressive development in the Arab world.

The Soviet people is as one with the Algerian people in its struggle against imperialism and in building a new life in Algeria. You are carrying out progressive socio-economic reforms in order, on the non-capitalist road, to overcome the burdensome heritage of the past and to ensure a better future for the workers of Algeria. You can be sure that in these, just as in your other progressive undertakings, you will always meet, from the side of the Soviet people, with understanding and readiness for co-operation in the spirit of Soviet-Algerian friendship.

**From THE JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON A VISIT
OF THE GOVERNMENT DELEGATION OF THE PEOPLE'S
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF YEMEN TO THE USSR**

October 10, 1971

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen has expressed gratitude to the Soviet Union for its consistent support of the just struggle of the Arab peoples against imperialist Israeli aggression, for lending Arab countries broad political and economic assistance and help in the strengthening of their armed forces. In its turn, the Soviet side rated highly the anti-imperialist and anti-reactionary course of the foreign policy of the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, which has great significance for the common cause of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples.

The sides exchanged opinions on the present situation in the area of the Persian Gulf and reaffirmed their solidarity with the peoples of the Persian Gulf, who are struggling for the complete abolition of the presence and rule of colonialism and neocolonialism, for the liquidation of all foreign military bases, for the national liberation and social progress of this area. The Soviet Union resolutely condemns the continued attempts of imperialism and reaction to intervene in the internal affairs of the PDRY, to hamper the strengthening of its progressive regime and the development of its economy.

**From A JOINT SOVIET-EGYPTIAN COMMUNIQUE
ON A VISIT OF PRESIDENT OF THE UAR ANWAR SADAT
IN THE USSR**

October 14, 1971

Taking into consideration the dangerous situation created in the Middle East as a result of the aggressive policy of Israel, the parties exchanged opinions on carrying out further joint steps in the struggle to overcome the consequences of Israeli aggression and to secure a just peace and security in this area. In particular, measures were agreed for the further strengthening of Egypt's military might.

President Anwar Sadat spoke highly of the great aid to the Arab peoples and states from the USSR and other socialist countries. He expressed the hope that the foundations of friendship and co-operation between Arab countries and the USSR would be strengthened to realise the aspirations of the Arab peoples for liberation, for their national interests and for strengthening their anti-imperialist position.

In this connection, it was stressed that the attempts to spread anti-communism and anti-Sovietism are calculated exclusively to split the ranks of the Arab revolutionary fighters. These attempts are also directed to breaking the solidarity and co-operation between the Arab peoples and their friends, the countries of the socialist community. The parties, therefore, resolutely condemn anti-communism and anti-Sovietism for inflicting damage to the aspirations for liberation and the national interests of the peoples and for serving only the interests of international imperialist forces.

President Anwar Sadat informed the Soviet leaders of the creation of the Federation of Arab Republics, stressing that its basic goal is the unification of the forces of the member states in the struggle against imperialism and Zionism, against the presence of imperialism in this area, and the overcoming of political, economic and social backwardness.

The leaders of the Soviet Union noted the necessity to strengthen the unity of the Arabs in the struggle against the common enemy—imperialism and Zionism—and expressed the hope that the federation would realise the aspirations of the Arab peoples and become a bulwark of unity of all truly progressive forces in the Arab world, would aid the rallying of the Arab ranks and their solidarity in the anti-imperialist struggle.

TREATY

of Friendship and Co-operation Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Iraq

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Iraq,

firmly convinced that the further development of friendship and all-round co-operation between them corresponds

to the national interests of both states and will serve the cause of peace throughout the world and in the region of the Arab countries, the interests of the freedom of peoples, their security and respect for their sovereignty;

considering the strengthening of the solidarity of all the forces of peace and progress, including the strengthening of the unity of the Arab states, on an anti-imperialist basis an important means of struggle for a firm peace and international security;

inspired by the ideals of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, Zionism and reaction, and for freedom, independence and the social progress of peoples;

convinced that in the contemporary world international problems must be resolved through co-operation and search for mutually acceptable solutions,

affirming their peace-loving foreign policy and their loyalty to the goals and principles of the United Nations Charter,

wishing to develop and strengthen the existing relations of friendship, co-operation and mutual trust, striving to raise these relations to a new level, have resolved to conclude the present Treaty and have agreed to the following.

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties declare that unbreakable friendship will exist between the two countries and their peoples and that all-round co-operation will develop in political, economic, trade, scientific, technological, cultural and other spheres on the basis of respect for state sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of each other.

Article 2

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Iraq declare that they will co-operate closely and thoroughly in securing conditions for the preservation and further development of the socio-economic achievements of their peoples and for respect for the sovereignty of each of them over all their natural resources.

Article 3

The High Contracting Parties, consistently following a policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social structures, will continue in the future, in accordance with their peace-loving foreign policy, to work for peace throughout the world, a lessening of international tension, the achievement of general and full disarmament, extending both to nuclear and ordinary types of arms, under effective international supervision.

Article 4

The High Contracting Parties, guided by the ideals of the freedom and equality of all peoples, condemn imperialism and colonialism in all their forms and manifestations. They will continue to wage an unwavering struggle against imperialism and Zionism and for the full, final and unconditional abolition of colonialism and neocolonialism, racialism and apartheid, to work for the rapid and complete implementation of the UN Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The Parties will co-operate with each other and with other peace-loving states in support of the just struggle of peoples for their sovereignty, freedom, independence and social progress.

Article 5

Attributing great significance to economic, technical and scientific co-operation between themselves, the High Contracting Parties will continue to expand and deepen this co-operation and the exchange of experience in industry, agriculture, irrigation and water economy, exploitation of oil and other national resources, in the field of communications and in other branches of the economy, and likewise in the training of specialists. The Parties will expand trade and shipping between the two states on the basis of equality, mutual benefit and the most-favoured-nation principle.

Article 6

The High Contracting Parties will further the development of contacts between themselves in the fields of science, art, literature, education, public health, press, radio, cinematography, television, tourism, sport and in other fields.

For a more complete acquaintance with the life, labour and achievements of the peoples of both countries in various fields, the Parties will aid the expansion of co-operation and direct contacts between state bodies and public organisations, enterprises, and cultural and scientific institutions of the two states.

Article 7

Attaching great significance to concerted action in the international arena for guaranteeing peace and security, and likewise to the development of political co-operation between the Soviet Union and Iraq, the High Contracting Parties will regularly consult each other at various levels on all important international questions that affect the interests of both states, as well as on questions of the further development of bilateral relations.

Article 8

In case of a threat to either of the Parties or a threat to peace or a violation of peace, the High Contracting Parties will immediately contact each other in order to co-ordinate their positions to remove the threat that has arisen or to restore peace.

Article 9

The High Contracting Parties, in the interests of the security of the two countries, will continue to develop their co-operation in the matter of strengthening their defence capacity.

Article 10

Each of the High Contracting Parties declares that it will not enter any alliances or take part in any groups of states, or in any actions or measures, directed against the other High Contracting Party.

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to prevent the use of its territory for the perpetration of any act that could inflict military harm on the other Party.

Article 11

Both High Contracting Parties declare that their responsibilities under existing international treaties do not contradict the provisions of the present Treaty and undertake not to conclude any international agreements, incompatible with it.

Article 12

The present Treaty is concluded for a period of 15 years and will be automatically extended for each successive period of five years unless one of the High Contracting Parties declares its desire to discontinue its operation, having informed the other High Contracting Party 12 months before the expiration of the term of operation of the Treaty.

Article 13

Any differences that may arise between the High Contracting Parties relative to the interpretation of any provision of the present Treaty will be resolved bilaterally in a spirit of friendship, mutual respect and understanding.

Article 14

The present Treaty is subject to ratification and will come into force from the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification, which will take place in Moscow in as short a time as possible.

The present Treaty is drawn up in two copies, each in Russian and in Arabic, both texts being equally authentic.

Done in Baghdad on April 9, 1972, which corresponds to 25th safar 1392 year of Hijra.

*For the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics*

A. Kosygin

*For the Republic
of Iraq*

A. H. al-Bakr

**From A JOINT SOVIET-EGYPTIAN COMMUNIQUE
ON A VISIT OF PRESIDENT OF THE ARAB
REPUBLIC OF EGYPT
ANWAR SADAT IN THE USSR**

April 30, 1972

Events of the last few months clearly show that circles hostile to the progressive movement in the Arab world and their agents have not abandoned their schemes to break the will of the Arab peoples, to undermine a political settlement and to force the Arabs to capitulate to the demands of the imperialists.

Under these conditions, the Arab states that have been subject to aggression have every basis to use other means, too, to return Arab lands seized by Israel.

...The Soviet side expressed complete support for the efforts of the Arab Republic of Egypt and other Arab countries directed to the liberation of Arab territories occupied by Israel. Inasmuch as the dangerous situation that is being maintained in the Middle East is fraught with danger for general peace, the Parties considered it necessary again, in the spirit of fraternal co-operation, to review the measures to defend the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab peoples, in particular through raising the military potential of the Arab Republic of Egypt. The Parties agreed to further strengthen military co-operation between them. It was agreed to conduct corresponding important measures in this direction.

**From A JOINT SOVIET-SYRIAN COMMUNIQUE
ON A VISIT OF PRESIDENT OF THE SYRIAN
ARAB REPUBLIC HAFEZ ASSAD IN THE USSR**

July 9, 1972

The Parties again resolutely declare that a just and firm peace can be established in the Middle East only on the basis of a rapid, complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and on the basis of guaranteeing the legal rights and interests of the Arab people of Palestine.

In this regard, the Parties again affirm their support for the Palestinian Resistance Movement as a part of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples.

The Soviet side reiterated its resolve to aid the just resolution of the Middle East problem, and likewise its readiness in the future to support the struggle of the Syrian Arab Republic, the Arab Republic of Egypt and other Arab states for the prompt abolition of the consequences of Israeli imperialist aggression.

The Parties agreed on measures for the further strengthening of the military potential of the SAR, the continuation of military co-operation between them, the exchange of opinions and for the holding of consultations on this question.

The Parties noted that the unity of action of the Arab states and the strengthening of their co-operation with the socialist countries is one of the important conditions for the success of the struggle against imperialism, Israeli imperialist aggression and Zionism. The development of co-operation between the Arab countries and the socialist community is an important factor for the success of the struggle of the Arab peoples for the strengthening of their political and economic independence, for their social and economic progress.

STATEMENT BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

September 18, 1972

Reports of new criminal actions by Israel against the peoples of the Arab countries are coming from the Middle East. Following the marauding raids by Israeli aircraft

on the territory of Syria and Lebanon on September 8 of this year, when the blood of hundreds of peaceful inhabitants—women, children and old people—was shed, Israeli ruling circles again undertook aggressive action in this area on September 16. Armoured and motorised units of the Israeli army, supported from the air, broke into the Southern regions of Lebanon and continue to move into the heart of the country. Lebanese villages have again been subjected to shelling and bombing, to napalm, their inhabitants are being killed. A state of emergency has been proclaimed in Lebanon.

The smoke-screen of Israeli propaganda, stirring up a racket around the tragic event in Munich, can never delude people. Neither Lebanon nor Syria bears any responsibility for these events. It is impossible to hide the obvious fact that we are witnessing military operations by Israel against the Arab peoples that were planned beforehand. From Tel Aviv there are reports of the preparation of new acts of plunder and violence against Lebanon, Syria and other Arab countries.

Thus, a dangerous escalation of aggression is taking place, heating up the situation in the Middle East, creating a serious threat to peace and security.

Acting with unlimited cynicism, ignoring the anger and protests of world opinion, Israeli ruling circles insolently violate the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations, the armistice agreement and the accepted norms of international law.

We cannot ignore the fact that the actions of the Israeli expansionists are encouraged by certain circles in the West, circles that, pursuing their own mercenary goals, are playing a dangerous game with fire in the Middle East. Those who openly or silently oppose, in particular in the UN, the adoption of resolute measures against the Israeli aggressors, bear serious responsibility with regard to the Arab and other peoples.

Peace-loving countries and peoples, all who share a belief in the need to rebuff the aggression, cannot stand aloof at the present difficult and crucial moment in the Middle East, they must demand that Tel Aviv immediately cease its aggression and withdraw its troops from Lebanese territory.

The Soviet Union, true to its principled policy of support for the just struggle of peoples for freedom, independence and territorial integrity, has been and remains on the side of the Arab peoples, who are trying to overcome the consequences of Israeli aggression. The Soviet Government, as before, feels that the path to easing tension and to a firm peace in the Middle East can only be one—the complete liberation of the Arab lands occupied by Israel in 1967 and an opportunity to live in peace and security to all peoples of this area.

Resolutely condemning the armed invasion into Lebanon by Israel, the Soviet Government supports the demand for the immediate cessation of aggression and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory.

The Israeli Government bears full responsibility for its criminal actions with regard to the Arab countries and for the lives of the peaceful inhabitants of Lebanon, including the Palestinian refugees living in Lebanon.

The Soviet Union, together with other peace-loving countries, will continue to work to end Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples and the establishment of a just and firm peace in the Middle East.

**From A JOINT SOVIET-IRAQI COMMUNIQUE
ON A VISIT OF PRESIDENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ AHMED HASSAN AL-BAKR
IN THE USSR**

September 20, 1972

The Parties expressed satisfaction with the development of contacts between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party. They agreed to continue to deepen and expand these contacts in the interests of the peoples of both countries, of the further strengthening of mutual understanding and of the intensification of the struggle for peace, progress and socialism and against imperialism, Zionism, and all forms of oppression and exploitation.

The Parties expressed their satisfaction with the development of co-operation between them in the creation and development of a national oil industry and also in overcoming diffi-

culties caused by the pressure of the international oil monopolies. The Parties expressed readiness to continue to develop their economic co-operation, trade, and scientific and cultural contacts.

The Soviet Union and Iraq agreed also on concrete measures for the further strengthening of the defence capacity of the Republic of Iraq in order to raise the combat readiness of its armed forces. President Ahmed Hassan al-Bakr expressed his deep gratitude to the Soviet Union for the co-operation and all-round support given by the Soviet Union to the Iraqi people in its struggle against imperialism and Zionism and for the construction of a new life.

**From A SPEECH BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL
OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR, A. N. KOSYGIN,
AT A RECEPTION IN HONOUR OF THE PRIME MINISTER
OF THE ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT, AZIZ SIDKI**

October 16, 1972

The Soviet Union has one foreign policy and one political line in Middle Eastern affairs. This line lends all kinds of support for the Arab peoples and progressive regimes in the Arab countries in their struggle against Israeli aggression. The Soviet Union follows this line in all its foreign policy actions and other steps connected with the situation in the Middle East.

Our Egyptian friends, and not only they, know well that, developing co-operation with the Arab Republic of Egypt and other Arab countries, we are not pursuing any mercenary interests. Moreover, the Soviet Union has voluntarily taken on itself obligations and responsibilities connected with many aspects of the situation in the Middle East after the Israeli aggression. We have done this because international solidarity with the peoples and governments waging a struggle against imperialism is one of the guiding principles of the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union. At a time when serious danger hung over Egypt, Syria and other Arab countries, the Soviet Union did everything possible for the restoration of their defence capacities.

We support our friends, carrying out the Soviet-Egyptian treaty on friendship and co-operation, which has become the political and legal basis of our relations. On the basis of our treaty and in the spirit of mutual trust the Soviet Union and the Arab Republic of Egypt can develop their relations with confidence. This is a reliable and principled foundation that corresponds to the interests of both countries.

Peace-loving public throughout the world is preoccupied with how the question of war and peace will be resolved in the Middle East. The Israeli leaders, obviously, think that they will place the Arabs in a hopeless position with their aggressive policy and will force the Arabs to renounce their just demands. These are dangerous illusions. In fact, the policy of Israel, supported by imperialist circles, is aimed, by continuing aggression, at creating an impasse to a political settlement in the Middle East. But this adventurist policy will lead only to an aggravation of the dangerous crisis in this region.

We feel that a just settlement in the Middle East in accordance with the well-known resolution of the UN Security Council remains a real goal. The way to this goal is through a close union of the Arab countries, the strengthening of their solidarity with the countries of the socialist community, with all the progressive forces in the world.

But while aggression goes on, while the rights of peoples and states are being violated, the Arab countries have the right to struggle against aggression, against infringements of their independence and territorial integrity, by any means. We are fully agreed with our Egyptian friends that concessions to the aggressor would only encourage him to commit new crimes.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and all the peoples of our country stand firmly on the side of Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Algeria and other Arab states in their just anti-imperialist struggle. We will continue to do everything possible to ensure complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and respect for the legal rights of all peoples of the Middle East, including the Arab people of Palestine.

**From A JOINT SOVIET-EGYPTIAN COMMUNIQUE
ON A VISIT OF THE PRIME MINISTER
OF THE ARE, AZIZ SIDKI,
IN THE USSR**

October 19, 1972

The Egyptian and Soviet sides feel that all states of the world and all peace-loving forces must exert pressure on Israel to force her to implement the Security Council resolution and the UN decisions on the withdrawal of troops from all occupied Arab territories, in order to obtain a firm and just peace. At the same time, the Soviet side affirms that the Arab states have the complete right to liberate their territories by various methods in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the legal right of states to defend their freedom.

The Soviet Union will continue to do everything possible to obtain the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and also to protect the legal rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

Both sides declare their conviction that Soviet-Egyptian friendship is an important factor in the struggle against imperialism and Zionism. They consider the unity of the progressive anti-imperialist forces a pressing necessity for the struggle against Israeli aggression, international imperialism and Zionism, against efforts directed at weakening Soviet-Egyptian friendship.

The Egyptian side expressed its gratitude to the Soviet Union for its great aid to the Arab Republic of Egypt in the development of the latter's economy, the strengthening of its military might and in other fields.

**From THE REPORT BY L. I. BREZHNEV
TO THE JOINT SESSION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE CPSU, THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR
AND THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

December 21, 1972

We have developed broad and many-sided relations with a number of Arab states. The whole course of events has

shown that friendship with the Soviet Union secures for the progressive Arab states needed aid and support in the moments most difficult for them. They know this well in Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Yemen. We have treaties of friendship with Egypt and Iraq, and we will develop our relations with these countries on the basis of these documents. We are fully determined to strengthen our friendly contacts with Syria, Algeria and with other Arab countries.

The international situation has now become more complex, so that all who desire a real strengthening of general peace must multiply their efforts to remove the seat of war in the Middle East and to overcome the consequences of Israeli aggression against the Arab states. Many states have called for the solution of the Middle East problems on the basis of the well-known UN Security Council resolutions. But, unfortunately, calling for this is by itself not enough. If these were strengthened with concrete political actions, then Israel would have to agree to a peaceful settlement, to recognise the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples. As for the Soviet Union, our readiness to make our contribution to this cause is well known.

... It is well known that in many developing countries there is a sharp struggle between new, progressive forces and internal reaction, which receives support from without, from imperialism. And one of the objects of this struggle is the development of relations with the world socialist community. The experience of the past, and current events too, show that the internal struggle can lead in some states to all sorts of reversals and zig-zags. We see this clearly.

However, the patriots of the former colonies and semi-colonies have passed through the solid political schooling of the national liberation revolutions. And the lessons that they received tell, in particular, that friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries aids the successful fight against imperialism, aids the strengthening of true independence of the liberated states.

**From THE COMMUNIQUE ON THE VISIT OF ISMAIL FAHMY,
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT, TO THE USSR**

January 24, 1974

...The two Sides came to a unanimous conclusion that the past period in the development of Soviet-Egyptian co-operation has highlighted its great significance not only for the peoples of the two countries, for the Arab states and the Soviet Union, but that it meets the interests of maintaining peace throughout the world. This co-operation rests not on temporary considerations of expediency, but on long-term foundations of principle by which the two Sides are guided in developing relations between them.

It was noted that the events in the Middle East in October last year again reaffirmed the strength and durability of Soviet-Egyptian friendship, its great significance in the struggle against the imperialist aggression in the Middle East, for peace, security and social progress of the Arab peoples. The Sides emphasised the desire to develop and strengthen mutual relations on the firm and long-term basis of the Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Arab Republic of Egypt of May 27, 1971.

During conversations particular attention was paid to the situation now obtaining in the Middle East, to the struggle for a just settlement and establishment of a durable peace in that area.

The Sides noted with satisfaction that the convening of the Geneva Peace Conference marks a major step towards normalising the Middle East situation. The Soviet Union and the Arab Republic of Egypt have confirmed their resolve to do everything in their power so that the Conference is crowned with success, and agreement on establishing a lasting peace in the area on the basis of the UN Security Council's resolutions is reached.

The Soviet Union and the Arab Republic of Egypt reaffirmed that the establishment of a lasting and just peace in the Middle East is impossible without the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967,

without due respect being shown for the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

It was noted that the Palestinian problem cannot be considered and resolved without representatives of the Arab people of Palestine. The Sides declared for equal participation of these representatives in the work of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East in the near future.

It was emphasised that a very important factor in the struggle for a just settlement in the Middle East is close co-ordination of actions of the Soviet Union and Egypt at all stages of this struggle, including the work of the Peace Conference on the Middle East, in all its working bodies that may be formed.

From THE SPEECH BY LEONID BREZHNEV, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE, AT A RALLY IN HAVANA, CUBA

January 30, 1974

...Peace, as we understand it, is restoration of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Arab peoples, rights that have been trampled upon by Israel's aggression; it means a constructive and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis.

That is precisely what the Soviet Union has firmly and consistently advocated.

The agreement between Egypt and Israel on the disengagement of troops, achieved in connection with the beginning of the Geneva Peace Conference, is a positive step, but it represents only a partial measure of a purely military character and so far affects only one of the Arab countries that were involved in the hostilities. Things must not of course stop here.

The Geneva Conference must carry out its main mission: to achieve a through political settlement and establish a lasting peace in the Middle East. But this aim can be attained only provided Israeli troops are withdrawn from all the Arab territories that were occupied in 1967 and the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine are respected. The UN decisions on the Middle East must be car-

ried out fully, in all their aspects and in the shortest possible period of time. The Soviet Union has made and will continue to make an active contribution to this important cause.

From THE COMMUNIQUE ON THE VISIT TO THE SOVIET UNION OF SADDAM HUSSEIN, DEPUTY GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE REGIONAL LEADERSHIP OF THE ARAB SOCIALIST RENAISSANCE PARTY AND DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMAND COUNCIL OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ

February 27, 1974

The Sides have reaffirmed with satisfaction that the friendly relations that exist between them are stable and determined by the deep-rooted interests of their peoples. These relations are developing fruitfully in full accord with the Soviet-Iraqi Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation and are based on the principles of equality, mutual respect, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention in each other's affairs. The two Sides have stressed their firm intent to continue to develop in every way possible and to strengthen their co-operation in political, economic and other areas for the benefit of the peoples of both countries. The Sides have indicated concrete measures and steps to attain the goals set.

In discussing international problems, special attention has been given to the situation in the Middle East. The participants of the talks are unanimous in their view that a just and stable peace in this area cannot be established unless all occupied Arab territories are liberated and the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine are guaranteed. The Sides have decisively condemned the policy of imperialist circles and the reactionary forces to recover, in one form or another, their domination and influence in this area, suppress the national liberation movement and to hamper the independent development of countries that have entered the path of social progress. They have reaffirmed the solidarity of the Soviet Union and the Republic of Iraq with the peoples struggling to eliminate the remnants of colo-

nialism, struggling against neocolonialism and racial discrimination and for security and peace throughout the world.

The Sides hold that rallying the Arab states around an anti-imperialist platform and strengthening their co-operation with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community is a prime condition for the Arab countries' successful struggle against Israeli aggression, for the strengthening of their national independence and for economic and social progress. The Soviet Union has declared that, as before, it will aid and support the Arab states in their just liberation struggle.

From THE SPEECH BY LEONID BREZHNEV, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE, AT A DINNER IN THE KREMLIN IN HONOUR OF HAFEZ ASSAD, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE ARAB SOCIALIST RENAISSANCE PARTY AND PRESIDENT OF THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

April 11, 1974

Our meeting takes place at an important moment. The courageous struggle of the Arab peoples, the concerted actions of the Arab countries, the firm support from the socialist states and from all the peaceful forces have all led to the weakening of the positions of the aggressor. The myth about the invincibility of the Israeli army has been dispelled. The Arab peoples proved that they would never put up with the occupation of their lands.

We all know about the decisions of the Security Council which opened the way for settling the conflict in its very essence. The authoritative international forum, the Geneva Conference, was set up for the first time. A durable and just settlement can and must be worked for within its framework.

Yet, it cannot be overlooked that the situation is still fraught with the danger of an explosion. And it cannot be otherwise until the main causes of tensions are removed, until the occupation of the Arab lands is ended, until the consequences of Israeli aggression are overcome and reliable

guarantees of security for all the countries in the Middle East are ensured.

This should be realised by all. The danger lies in the fact that against the background of a certain decrease of tensions, the aggressor state and her patrons may again try to avoid a radical, all-encompassing solution of the problem. It is not accidental, I should say, that "makeshift plans" for the Middle East settlement have been launched of late. This actually means replacing the overall settlement with "partial" agreements of various kinds.

As to the Soviet Union's position, it is clear and consistent. Our policy invariably was and will be aimed against aggression, in support of the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples. We are for a just peace in the Middle East, which means the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all the lands occupied in 1967 and later, the ensurance of security and sovereignty of all the states of the area, and respect for the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. We fully share with Syria the view that any agreement on troop disengagement must be regarded as part and parcel of the overall Middle East settlement, as a step to the complete withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab lands.

We highly appreciate the policy of the Syrian leadership headed by the General Secretary of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party, President Hafez Assad, aimed at strengthening friendship between Syria and the Soviet Union and developing contacts between the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party and the CPSU. As to the Soviet Union, you can always rely on it: it always did, and will continue to do everything to strengthen the fraternal links with the Syrian people, to support Syria's struggle for the consolidation of its independence and social progress.

From THE JOINT SOVIET-SYRIAN STATEMENT ON THE VISIT TO THE SOVIET UNION OF HAFEZ ASSAD, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE ARAB SOCIALIST RENAISSANCE PARTY AND PRESIDENT OF THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

April 16, 1974

... In recent years Soviet-Syrian co-operation has acquired a broad and comprehensive character. It is developing along

state, party and public lines, and encompasses political, economic and cultural spheres. It also covers the area of defence, whose importance for Syria in the circumstances of the continued Israeli aggression is a matter of common knowledge.

The Soviet Union and the Syrian Arab Republic are confident that the unbreakable friendship and fraternal co-operation of the Soviet and Syrian peoples meet the vital interests of both countries, and serve the cause of stronger peace and international security.

...The Sides paid specific attention to the recent developments in the Middle East.

The Sides stress again with full determination that peace and quiet in the Middle East may be achieved only by the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab lands, and by securing the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

It was stressed in the discussion of the ways of solving the Middle East conflict that the current partial measures fail to cover the main, key elements of the settlement, that any agreement on troop disengagement should be made within the context of the general solution of the Middle East problem, a step towards the radical and all-inclusive solution, whose central point should be the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab lands and the ensurance of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

The Sides again emphasised the importance of the participation of the Soviet Union at all stages and in all areas of the settlement directed towards the establishment of a fair and firm peace in the Middle East.

The Sides noted that the explosive situation existing now on the Syrian front confirms more than ever before that ignoring the above-mentioned main principles, or slighting them might lead to a further worsening of the already dangerous situation in that area.

From THE SPEECH BY ALEXEI KOSYGIN, MEMBER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR, AT A DINNER IN THE KREMLIN IN HONOUR OF A. S. JALLOUD, MEMBER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMAND COUNCIL AND PRIME MINISTER OF THE LIBYAN ARAB REPUBLIC

May 14, 1974

...I would like to stress that the policy of the Soviet Union in Middle East affairs, our policy of maximum support for the struggle of the Arab peoples against Israeli aggression, against imperialism, Zionism and reaction, is inseparable from our convictions of principle.

The firmness of our convictions stems from the consistency of the position of our Communist Party and of the Soviet Government on the Middle East problem. The essence of this position is well known. The Soviet Union condemns the policy of aggression carried out by Israel with the support of external imperialist forces and holds that there can be no stable and just peace in the Middle East unless Israeli troops are withdrawn from all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and thereafter, unless the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine are guaranteed. Any agreements on the disengagement of troops must be viewed as preliminary steps on the way to an overall settlement: other measures must follow in order to implement the well-known resolutions of the UN Security Council.

We emphasise this side of the matter because the aggressor and his patrons have recently shown their intent to substitute half-measures, creating only an appearance of detente in the Middle East, for an overall Middle East settlement.

We hope that Soviet-Libyan relations will also develop in the interests of the common struggle of the Arab countries for overcoming the consequences of Israeli aggression and will serve to rally them around an anti-imperialist platform in this struggle.

From THE COMMUNIQUE ON THE VISIT TO THE USSR OF
A. S. JALLOUD, MEMBER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY
COMMAND COUNCIL AND PRIME MINISTER OF THE
LIBYAN ARAB REPUBLIC

May 20, 1974

The Libyan guests... highly appreciated the achievements of the Soviet people in developing the socialist economy and advancing social, scientific and technological progress, as well as the role played by the Soviet Union in the international arena to strengthen peace and security.

The Soviet Side voiced support for the measures carried out by the Libyan Arab Republic to ensure its independent economic development and establish full control and rule over its national natural resources.

The two Sides pointed out with satisfaction that there are all possibilities for the further fruitful development of all-round Soviet-Libyan relations.

There was an extensive exchange of opinion on current international problems, with special attention being given to questions relating to the situation in the Middle East. The two Sides strongly condemned Israel, Zionism and the imperialist forces supporting them, forces which continue to constantly aggravate the situation in the Middle East and threaten world peace and security. They again insist on the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and on the assurance of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. They are convinced that without observing these conditions it is impossible to achieve a radical and all-embracing settlement of the situation in the area.

The two Sides stated that they regard the Palestinian resistance movement as an integral part of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples and will continue to give it every assistance.

It was stressed unanimously during the exchange of opinions that the strengthening of the unity of action by the Arabs on the basis of social progress and democracy is of great importance in the struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction.

The two Sides stressed the importance of Arab-Soviet friendship and the friendship of Arabs with the states of the socialist community and called for strengthening and deepening this friendship on the basis of mutual respect. They will work to strengthen this friendship in all fields, regarding it as a very important factor in the liberation struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

From THE COMMUNIQUE ON THE VISIT OF
ANDREI GROMYKO, MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE USSR, TO THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

May 30, 1974

...The talks re-affirmed the Sides' community of views on all questions. The Sides affirmed yet again that a just settlement of the Middle East problem can be achieved only on the basis of the complete evacuation by Israel of all occupied Arab territories and by guaranteeing the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

The Sides consider that, immediately after reaching agreement on and implementing in all particulars a troop disengagement on the Syrian front, the necessary measures must be taken to achieve an overall, just settlement that will secure the fulfilment of the corresponding resolutions of the United Nations.

The Syrian Side confirmed its position that the Soviet Union must take part in all areas of a settlement directed at establishing a just and stable peace in the Middle East.

The Soviet Side again confirmed that the policy of the Soviet Union to render comprehensive support to the Syrian Arab Republic in its struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression has not changed.

From THE SPEECH BY LEONID BREZHNEV, GENERAL
SECRETARY OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE, AT AN
ELECTION MEETING OF THE CONSTITUENCY IN THE
BAUMANSKY DISTRICT OF MOSCOW.

June 14, 1974

In many ways owing to the policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, owing to the change in the climate

in international relations, there have emerged more favourable conditions for the struggle against imperialist aggression and for the elimination of the hotbed of war in the Middle East. Agreements on disengagement of troops in the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights areas have been reached. At the same time it is necessary to realise that only the first steps have been made. The main questions of a settlement are still to be considered at the Geneva Conference. This is an extremely complex task. It can be accomplished only through combined efforts of the states participating in the conference.

The Soviet Union contributes and will continue to contribute to this cause. Our stand with regard to a final settlement of the Middle East crisis is well known. Progress towards a settlement will create conditions for the development of relations between the Soviet Union and all the countries of the Middle East. A durable and just peace should at last be established in the Middle East.

From THE SPEECH BY NIKOLAI PODGORNÝ, CHAIRMAN OF THE PRESIDÍUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR, IN MOSCOW AT A DINNER IN HONOUR OF A PARTY AND GOVERNMENT DELEGATION OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF YEMEN

July 18, 1974

...The Soviet Union insistently and consistently supports the cause of freedom and prosperity of the Arab peoples and provides them with comprehensive aid in resolving the tasks of social and economic development, in the matter of a settlement in the Middle East. A stable and just peace in this area can only be reached if Israeli troops are withdrawn from all occupied Arab territories and the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine are secured.

The first steps towards the elimination of the hotbed of war in the Middle East have now been made, agreement has been reached on the disengagement of troops on the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights. But the principle question of a settlement remains to be dealt with at the

Geneva Peace Conference, which, in our opinion, must resume its work as quickly as possible.

From THE SPEECH BY LEONID BREZHNEV, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE, AT THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF MOLDAVIA AND THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE MOLDAVIAN SSR

October 11, 1974

At present, the Israeli invaders are still holding and gradually assimilating the territories they have seized. And the Israeli government leaders, apparently enjoying the support of their traditional foreign patrons, are trying in every way to avoid a resumption of the Geneva Conference on a peaceful settlement and declare, as if to make it perfectly clear to all the world, that Israel will never even think of going back to the 1967 boundaries.

The Arab states are quite legitimately outraged by this. Naturally, the Soviet Union, as before, fully supports their just cause. Our large-scale and continually developing friendly co-operation with Syria, Egypt, Iraq and the leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organisation is a factor of no small importance which works for the elimination of the aftermath of aggression, and to achieve a just peace.

It is necessary, at long last, to implement the decisions of the United Nations Organisation and to secure the liberation of the lands seized by Israel, the satisfaction of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, their right to their national hearth. This should be done without further delay, if we want to see a lasting peace in the Middle East. Postponing the solution of these problems and freezing the present situation, which only benefits the Israeli invaders, means sitting on a gunpowder keg that can explode any moment.

That is why the USSR is working resolutely for a speedy and effective resumption of work by the Geneva Peace Conference with the participation of all the interested parties, including the Palestinians. A just and lasting peace must be established at long last in the Middle East.

**From THE SPEECH BY NIKOLAI PODGORNYY, CHAIRMAN
OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR,
IN MOSCOW AT A DINNER IN HONOUR OF THE SHAH
OF IRAN**

November 18, 1974

...The situation in the Middle East remains fraught with serious complications and requires that no little effort be applied until a just and stable peace is established in the area. The Soviet Union proceeds from the consideration that a final settlement of the Middle East problem is only possible if Israeli troops are withdrawn from all Arab lands occupied in 1967, the security and independence of all countries in the region are guaranteed and the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine are upheld, including its right to self-determination and statehood. These problems must be solved by the Geneva Peace Conference, and we call for the immediate resumption of its work.

**From THE SPEECH BY LEONID BREZHNEV, GENERAL
SECRETARY OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE, AT THE
ANNIVERSARY MEETING IN ULAN BATOR, CAPITAL
OF THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC**

November 26, 1974

...Meanwhile, the situation in the Middle East is not only not getting better but, on the contrary, it is getting more and more fraught with the danger of an explosion. This is encouraged by the brazenly provocative policy of Israel, which is openly sabotaging the cause of peaceful settlement, with obvious support from outside. The Soviet Union's point of view is well known: the only reliable road to a lasting peace in the Middle East is the complete liberation of all Arab lands occupied in 1967; the realisation of the legitimate right of the Arab people of Palestine to build up their statehood, to self-determination, and also the provision of a reliable and authoritative guarantee of security and independence for all the states that have now been drawn into this sphere of conflict.

All this can and must be achieved within the framework of the Geneva Peace Conference, which has been set up specially, in accordance with UN decisions. We should continue to work together with the friendly Arab states, for a speediest resumption of its work.

...Once again we declare clearly to all those whom it may concern: the Soviet Union was, is and will be vitally interested in the earliest possible settlement for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

**From THE COMMUNIQUE ON THE VISIT TO THE USSR OF THE
DELEGATION OF THE PALESTINE LIBERATION
ORGANISATION, HEADED BY YASSER ARAFAT, CHAIRMAN
OF THE PLO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

December 1, 1974

In the course of the talks which passed in a friendly atmosphere, the Sides had a detailed exchange of opinions on the Middle East situation, on questions connected with the Middle East settlement and the possible ways of solving the Palestine problem.

On behalf of the Arab people of Palestine, the delegation expressed profound gratitude for the noble principled stand of the Soviet Union on the solution of the Palestine problem and the Middle East settlement, and for permanent disinterested and effective aid which the Soviet Union renders the Arab countries and peoples in their struggle against imperialism, Zionism, aggression, for national independence, peace and social progress.

The Soviet Side expressed confidence that the settlement of the whole complex of Middle East problems can be achieved most effectively within the framework of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East in whose work representatives of the Arab people of Palestine must take part on an equal footing with its other participants.

The Soviet Union supports and will continue to support the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their legitimate rights, including their inalienable right to self-determination and the creation of their own national home, up to the formation of their statehood.

The Soviet Side declared that under an agreement reached earlier, appropriate practical measures had been taken for opening in Moscow of a PLO representation at the earliest date, which fact was received with great satisfaction by the Palestine delegation.

The Sides declared that the visit of the PLO delegation to Moscow was an important contribution to the development of the relations of friendship and co-operation in the interests of implementing the national aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine within the framework of an overall just settlement and the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

Put out recently

Progress. Problems of the Third World Series:

SOLODOVNIKOV V., BOGOSLOVSKY V. *Non-Capitalist Development: Historical Experience.*

Chapter I of this book by two Soviet specialists on Africa gives a brief exposition of the Marxist-Leninist concept of non-capitalist development, and discusses the external and internal political and economic conditions that enable economically backward countries to advance towards socialism by-passing the capitalist stage of development.

Chapter II deals with the experience of non-capitalist development in the republics of Soviet Central Asia and the Mongolian People's Republic.

The subsequent chapters analyse the emergence and development of socialist-oriented states in Asia and Africa, economic and political transformations in these countries, and the place of these countries in the struggle between imperialism and socialism.

The Soviet Side declared that under an agreement reached earlier, appropriate practical measures had been taken for opening in Moscow of a PLO representation at the earliest date, which fact was received with great satisfaction by the Palestine delegation.

The Sides declared that the visit of the PLO delegation to Moscow was an important contribution to the development of the relations of friendship and co-operation in the interests of implementing the national aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine and of an overall just settlement and the lasting peace in the Middle East.

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

Will soon publish

Progress. Problems of the Third World Series:

KLOCHKOVSKY L. *Economic Neo-Colonialism*.

This book by Professor L. Klochkovsky, Dr. Sc. (Econ.), is devoted to an analysis of the basic changes, in the post-World War II period, in the economic relations of the imperialist powers with the countries of Southeast Asia. A detailed description is given of the economic positions in Southeast Asia of the major capitalist states; the basic trends of their economic policies are considered and the specific features of inter-imperialist contradictions in the given region are shown. The author pays considerable attention to the different forms, methods and consequences of economic neo-colonialism in Southeast Asia and to the struggle of the peoples of the new Asiatic states against imperialist economic aggression, for a radical reorganisation of their external economic relations and for liberation from imperialist exploitation.

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

Will soon publish

Progress. Problems of the Third World Series:

BRUTENTS K. *National Liberation Revolutions Today*. In 2 parts

This book by the eminent Soviet journalist and specialist on international affairs regards national liberation revolutions as revolutions of a special type in the world liberation movement. The author examines their social, economic, political and ideological specifics, the internal and international conditions of their development, and motive forces and allies. Great attention is paid to the theory and experience of non-capitalist development and the socialist system's role in activating and realising the progressive tendencies of the national liberation struggle. The book gives a detailed criticism of imperialist attempts to impede the developing countries' progress. The latest revisionist concepts of the world revolutionary process are also criticised.